MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

NOTES ON HALL'S CONCISE ANGLO-SAXON DICTIONARY. I.

WHEN Mr. Hall set to work on his Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, it was with the avowed purpose of enabling the student to have 'something better to begin with than the Ettmüller or Bosworth of forty or fifty years ago.' And, in fact, with the wealth of sources to draw upon, he might have given us a work that could safely be placed into the hands of the beginner and that would prove to be a real assistance to him in the study of Old English. However, Mr. Hall's principal aim seems to have been to swell the bulk of his book, so that he might be able to say that 'the number of words given which are not to be found in the parts of Bosworth-Toller already issued is upwards of two thousand.' With that goal in view, he has not troubled himself with carefully examining his sources: Leo's dictionary, Bosworth's, Wülker's reëdition of Wright's glossaries, Sweet's *Oldest English Texts*, etc., are simply so many books that furnish him material for compilation; wherever he finds anything looking like a word that might be entered in his book, he forthwith puts it down. No wonder, then, that a good many 'repeaters' have made their appearance and swelled the volume of the legitimate vote. For example, Leo in his dictionary, exhibits a compound *sygdiryftr*, which is the *sigdiriftr* on record in the Epinal-Erfurt glossaries as Old English for *falcis* (*Corpus Gloss. Lat.* v, 361, 3)=*siðe riftras* in the *Corpus Glossary* (WW. 21, 17). This *sigdi riftr* Sweet in his OET. gives correctly as two words and accordingly we find in Hall's book for the two words three entries, namely,

sigdi=siðe.

rifter sm. reaping-hook, sicle, scythe; and *sygdiryfter* sm. plane? (Leo).

In the MSS. the forms for *f* and *w* are often so nearly alike that they have given rise to many misunderstandings and errors in transcribing. Owing to such a mistake Leo has a form *beaf* (for *beaw*) and so we find by the side of the correct '*beaw* sm. gadfly,' the wrong '*beaf* gadfly (Leo)' in Hall's book. Just as *f* and *w*, so appear *p* and *r* occasionally mixed up, owing to the similarity of their form in the MSS.; so we have WW. 240, 16 flebilis *werendlic* mistakenly for *wependlic*, but Hall, indiscriminately, has taken up both forms; I do not know to whom he is indebted for the correct entry '*wependlic* deplorable, mournful,' but from Wright-Wülker 240, 16, he got:

'*werendlic* lamentable, doleful.'

In the *Corpus Glossary* (ed. Hessels, C 443) there is a *clibecti* explaining *clibosum;* Sweet, owing to some strange mistake thought this meant 'cleaving' and thus it appears in Hall's book. This same *clibosum* occurs again WW. 364, 19 glossed *clifihte*, then in the form *cliuosum* i. *inclinatum*,WW. 205, 33, glossed *clifæhtig* and finally as '*cliuosus clifig, tohyld* WW. 111, 36, and so we find then by the side of the wrong '*clifeht*, cleaving' the two correct entries of the same word:

'*clifæhtig*, steep, and *clifig, clifiht*, steep.' There is no documentary evidence justifying such an entry as *eorðcrypel*, 'earth-creeper,' paralytic, palsied man; it is simply an invention of Mr. Sweet who in this way tried to get at the meaning of the gloss *applare eorscripel* which he found in the *Corp. Gl.* (ed. Hessels, A 706=WW. 6, 23.) Very likely *applare* is blunder for *auriculare* or *auriscalpū* (*auris scalprum*, cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* ii, 482, 57). At any rate, the *eorscripel* of the *Corp. Glossary* is surely identical with the *earscrypel* of WW. 291, 27 glossing *auricularis*, which Hall has entered as *ear-scripel -scrypel* 'earpicker, little finger.' By the side of that we find also the entry *eorscripel=earscripel*, that is to say, the very same word which already had been entered in the wrong form *eorðcripel* was entered again, only now in its right form, *eorscripel*. It is just so with the words: *ecilma, æcelma, æcilma.* Under *ecilma* you are referred to *æcelma* which is explained as meaning 'chilblain,' for *æcilma* we must be satisfied with the Latin *palagra* that appears WW. 227, 8. (Of *ecilmehti*, glossing *palagdrigus* WW. 38, 7, he does not make any mention at all.) Now, if Mr. Hall had

carefully examined his sources, he would not have been taken in by Mr. Sweet's ' *æcelma*, chilblain,'[1] for then he could not have failed to see that the *palagra* glossed *ecilma*, WW. 37,24 (to which gloss Sweet's *æcelma*,chilblain,' refers) is identical with the *palagra* glossed *æcilma*, WW. 277,8, and also with the *palagra* glossed *æcelma*, WW. 468, 14. As to the word *palagra*, it looks like a conflation of a Latin and Greek word, perhaps it is=*paleæ acyra* (=ἄχυρα), cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* iii, 299, 64, αχυρα, *paleae*; *ibid.* 508, 22 *axyra*,*palea*; 508, 23 *axras*, *palea*; 193, 49 *achura*, *palea*. The Old English *æcelma* (*æcilma*, *ecilma*) would then be a derivative of *æcil* (*ecil*)[2]= *egl* by means of the suffix -*ma*[3] (cf. Northumbrian *wæst*: common Anglo-Saxon *wæstma wæstm*, MHG. *bluost*: Anglo-Saxon *blóstma*). We can then also dispose of WW. 38, 7 *palagdrigus ecilmehti* which would be *paleariumg. acyreon*[4] (=ἄχυρεῶν, cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* iii, 299, 77) *ecilmehci*=*ecilmecci*, cf. OHG. *gauissa-hi quisquiliæ*. The meaning of the word would then be ' heap of ails (eils),' ' bran-bin.' Cockayne thinks that *palagra* is corrupted, from *podagra*, which is certainly possible, but hardly probable in this instance, since the Anglo-Saxon interpretation is not in favor of it. For,it must be borne in mind, these Anglo-Saxon explanations are (as a rule) but substitutes of former Latin interpretations and they generally keep close to the meaning of the Latin words they represent. Now if *podagra*

---

[1] Sweet has it from Cockayne. *Leechd.* ii, 367.

[2] Cf. *Epinal Glossary*, ed. Sweet, p. 21, E 12 *quisquiliæ ahrian* (=*Corp. Gl. Lat.* v, 385, 48); *Erfurt Gl.* (=*Corp. Gl. Lat.* v, 385, 48) *quisquiliæ ægrihan*.

[3] This suffix gives the word a tinge of generality, as seen from the *Erfurt Gloss. tyndir-m* (*Corp. Gloss. Lat.* v, 367, 27)=everything pertaining to 'tinder.' Just so we have *wyrsm* (by metathesis *wyrms*,WW. 210, 42 *colera uentris inflatio uel solutio wyrms* and from that *wyrmsig*,WW.494, 7 *purulentis ðæm wyrmsigum*) by the side of *wyrs* in WW. 113, 8 *phtisis wyrs-hrǣcing* uel *wyrs us*(=*ur*)*spiung*. Hence I think that the interpretation *deagwyrmede* appearing WW. 161, 31 for *podagricus* ought to be *ðeohgewyrsmede*, 'suffering with thigh-(hip-) disease,' and *dæggede* stands very likely for *ðeoh* *acede* 'suffering with thigh-(hip-)ache.' Hall has taken up both words without a challenge. In Gregory's *Past. Care* i, 273, 22 (E.ETS., ed. Sweet) we meet with a *wors-m putredo* (*Epinal Gloss.*, ed. Sweet, p. 19, C. 7) *pus wors-m*.

[4] These may have been steps of corruption: *paleariūg. agyreor*, *paleargarigeor*, *palagorigur*, *palagdrigus*.

had been the lemma, the interpretation would very likely have been *dolor pedum* and that no such thing can be represented by *æcelma*, is clear, whether we take it to mean as Cockayne does 'annoying chill' or as I should say, 'furfuration.' The way Cockayne has arrived at the meaning 'chilblain' is this: Mone[1a] exhibits a gloss *mulas acelman*. *Mula*,however, according to *Gl. Harl.* 3388, *est quædam infirmitas in homine quæ vocatur gybehos*, that is, says Cockayne, 'kibe of heel,' which is confirmed by Florio's *mulé Kibes chilblanes* and Cotgrave's *mule a Kibe*. But Mone's *mules*,I have reason to believe, is rather mutilation of *glumulas* and *glumula* we find glossed WW. 412, 3 by *gewrid egenu oððe scealu*, which fits in with the explanation we have offered and also *Leechd.* ii, 70 *þis sceal wiþ æcelman and wiþ þon þe men acaleþ fel of þam fotum* can well be explained along those lines: ' This is to be used against furfuration and in case one gets the skin of the feet furfuraceous, that is, the skin peals off.' And that our explanation of *æcelma* would hold good, even if *palagra* is all right as it seems, is to be inferred from *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* iii, 604, 23, *palagra pustulu rupta in cute*. Likely enough, is this *palagra* identical with modern Italian *pellagra*; '*malattia molto frequente dei nostri paesi subalpini . . . Malattia della pella dell'ordine delle impetigini,laquale particolarmente attacca il dorso delle mani e de'piedi con senso molesto di stiramento, di prurito e di ardore, a cui succede lo screpolamento della cuticola, per cui cadendo questa sotto la forma di squamma furfuracee rimane la dermide denudata, presentando dalle macchie irregolari rossice e lucenti*, as the *Dizionario* of Tommaseo-Bellini has it. Of course, if *palagra* is *one* word, then *palagdrigus* may be a mistake for the adjective derived from it, *palagricus* and *ecilmehti* is then *ecilm-ehti*(*g*) ' full of furfuration, inclined to be furfuraceous.'

From *egl* (*egle*), the Old English representative of modern *ail* (mote, beard on wheat), Hall, in the way characteristic of him, has succeeded in getting three entries; namely (1) '*egl*, sf.,mote, beard on wheat,'(2) '*egle*, sf.,dormouse, (3) '*elgum*' dp. of sb. '*aristis*,' WW. 532,

---

[1a] *Quellen und Forschungen*, etc., p. 359, 11.

27. From Bosworth (probably) he took the right rendering 'beard on wheat,' from Sweet's *Oldest English Texts* the wrong one 'dormouse,' and from Wright-Wülker the Latin 'aristis' which he did not care or dare to translate. Sweet, of course, was misled by the fact that in our Latin dictionaries there is only a 'glis, gliris = dormouse' on record. But the Latin Glossaries know also of a *glis, glitis*5 (=glus, glutis?) and that the Anglo-Saxon glossators had reference only to that word Hall might easily have established, if he had taken the trouble to compare the passages quoted by Sweet, OET., p. 524b, under *egel, egla, eglan, eglum, elgum.*

Then he would surely not have committed that ridiculous blunder either of making out of the corrupted Latin *fonfyr* (=*furfur*, 'bran'), occurring WW. 413, 12, an Anglo-Saxon '*fonfyr* sb. dormouse.'6 In what careless, nay frivolously reckless way, Hall has gathered his words may be seen from the following two entries: (1) '*æmbern* sb. *bothonia, bædromia?*' WW. 195, 20 [*ymbryne?*], and (2) '*embren* sn. bucket, pail' ES. viii, 154 [Germ. *Eimer*]. Both entries refer to the same gloss, namely, WW. 195, 20, the only difference between the two numbers being, that (1) repeats Wülker's bad conjecture, while (2) gives the correct explanation as pointed out by Sievers (ES. viii, 154) when criticizing Wülker's guess at the meaning of the word. The only inference to be drawn from such a proceeding as that is that Hall was fully aware of the precariousness of his first entry, but did not care to miss an opportunity of adding to his stock of words when he could do so on the apparent authority of an Anglo-Saxon scholar like Wülker. This inference is borne out by further facts I shall submit. By the side of the right entry: *fæsten*, sn., 'fastness fortified place, castle, etc.,' we find the nonsensical: *wefæsten*, sn., 'citadel,' on the strength of WW. 515, 39: *quasi arx swa wefæsten*, al-

though Sievers had drawn his attention to the fact that this is a blunder for *swaswe fæsten*. Side by side with the only authentic entry: *helpendrap*, sm., 'opifera' (WW. 463, 35), meaning 'steadying line,'7 we meet with an entry *helpend-bær*, a word for which there is no documentary evidence, but which is only a bad conjecture of Wülker for *helpendrap* which he did not understand, as pointed out by Sievers. By the side of: *æswica*, wm., 'offender, deceiver, hypocrite, traitor, deserter,' which is based on WW. 219, 35 and pronounced all right by Sievers, there is entered an: *æscwiga*, 'spear-warrior,' drawn from Wülker's ill-advised attempt at altering the proper word *æswica*.

Just so the very same gloss (WW. 41, 8) *probus ferht* furnishes him on the one hand an adjective *fehrt* 'honest,' and on the other hand a noun *fehrt*8 =*fyrhtu*, that is to say, for the first entry he relied on Sweet's OET., who explained the word correctly enough; for the second, however, although warned by Sievers, he drew on Wülker's conjecture, saying that *probus* is mistake for *phobus*=φοβος. This smuggling in of such a questionable word as *ferht* for *fyrthu* is the more reprehensible as Hall does not cite his authority for it, just as he failed to do in a good many other cases. *Ferht* is of course an adjective derived by means of the suffix -*eht* (='having') from the noun *ferh* (='life'), and is certainly a good rendering for *probus*. Hall could not have failed to gather from Sievers' remarks on WW. 32, 28, how silly it was of Wülker to repeat Bosworth's ridiculous guess at the meaning of *hearma*, but, intent as he was on increasing his stock of words, he was well satisfied with being supplied by Sweet with a *hearma* meaning 'shrewmouse, ermine,' and by Wülker with a *hearma* meaning 'a sling for supporting a wounded arm'; *hearma* of course is related to German *Hermel*, and is a sort of weasel or stoat, as is evident from WW. 34, 7: *netila* (=*nitela*) *hearma*.

This desire to swell at any cost his wordlist really seems to have blinded Hall's judgment. Or is there any other construction to be

5 Cf. **WW.** 118, 37 Loewe, *Coniect. ad Gloss. Lat.*, p. 120.

6 Very likely also a third Anglo-Saxon word quoted by Hall from WW. 119, 5=320, 29 as equivalent for 'dormouse,' namely, *sisemus* represents by its first part the translation for *glis, glitis, sise* being mistake for *sifeþe* (cf. WW. 549, 1, 2), and by its second part, *mus*, the translation for *glis, gliris*.

7 Cf. WW. 182, 29 and 288, 27.

8 However, it is just possible that he refers to WW. 77, 5, *pauor ferht*, although he does not cite any authority.

put upon his entering by the side of the right forms such evident blunders as : *nepe*, 'fierce' for *repe*, or *wægel*, 'gill, quarter of a pint, small vessel,' for *pægel*, especially when we consider that he did so after having read Sievers' remarks on the respective passages, WW. 479, 33 and 124, 2 ? Why did he enter: *wæterrap*, 'cable' from WW. 535, 4, when from his previous entry: *wæderap*, 'cable,' taken from WW. 515, 15 and referring to the same Latin word *rudens*, he could not but have learned that *wæderap* is the only correct form (cf. WW. 5, 44: *antemne wæde?* What does he mean by entering from *Haupt's Zeitschrift* the unexplained and corrupt form *duphaman* 'malleoli,' when a comparison with the later entry *dyp-homar-homer* must have told him that *duphaman* is simply misreading or blunder for *duphamar*, and then a glance in his Latin dictionary and at WW. 492, 40 *malleoli tyndercyn idest dyphomer* would have suggested 'saplings (such as are cut for) kindling wood,' as proper rendering for *duphamar*, *dyphomar*, *dyphomer*.9

Hall thoroughly understands the art of getting much out of little; so the one gloss *deuia callus* (*h*)*orweg stig* (WW. 17, 16; 384, 40; 220, 36) has given him occasion for three entries : (1) *horweg*, aj., 'muddy'; (2) *horuweg*, sm., 'dirty road'; (3) *orwegstig*, sf., 'out-of-the-way-track.' (1) to be sure, is to be put on Sweet's account (cf. OET., p. 576a); but if Hall had looked into the matter, he would have found out from 220,36 that *devia* is *orweg*, that is, 'trackless' and *callus* (=*callis*), *stig*, that is, 'path, road.' As in this instance the wrongly aspirated form of the word has played him a trick, so in several others. WW. 385, 3 we read *descurris hofðelum ;* as he could not make anything of it, but still wished to use it as material for his book, he bodily transferred it there. To understand the gloss, we have simply to properly divide it: *de scurris*, and then it becomes plain that *hof* must stand for *of*, and *ðelum* is=*ðylum* ; cf. 458, 15 *oratores ðylæs*, whence he got his entry: *ðyle*, sm.,

9 But is *dup-*, *dyp-*, the right form of the first part of the word ? When I compare such compounds as *ðyfe-þorn* WW. 149, 39, *rixc-þyfel* 289, 3 and the diminutive *þyfel* 137, 26; 139, 19-24; 244, 20.22; 324, 38 and the verb 408, 2 *frutescit þufaþ*, 492, 29 *luxoriante faeste geþnf*, I cannot help thinking that we ought to read *ðufhammar*, *ðyfhomar*, *ðyfhomer* 'a sapling of luxuriant growth,' as is the *malleolus*.

'spokesman, speaker, orator,' and as he might have added from 385, 3, 'funmaker, humorist.' Also bodily transferred is the gloss *repagulum salpanra* WW. 106, 7, and yet Sievers had already pointed out that we have to read *sal punda*, that is, 'the pound-bar, inclosure-bar, fence-rail'; cf. 43, 26 *repagula sale*, referring to which gloss Sweet (OET., p. 587a) wrongly explains *sal* as 'bond'; it is rather 'a bar, pole, rail, stick'; in fact it is the contracted form of *sagol*, glossed *fustis* 332, 30, or *sagul*, glossed *paxillus* (for that is the true reading) 126, 18. It is also met with in the Anglo-Saxon (c. 1000) translation of the Gospels, Matt. 26, 47: *sahlum fustibus*, and Marc. 14, 43: *sahlum lignis*.

Intent as Hall was on new words, he has been repeatedly taken in by Wülker. So in WW. 460, 4 the latter did not see that the glossator explained *oreæ*, the archaic Latin word for 'bridle,' by the more modern one *frena*, nor did he know Latin enough to recognize in the *numine leso* 456, 27 the Latin *numine læso*. Consequently we have the two fine entries: *fræne* 'oreæ' and *leso*, sf., 'numen.' Likewise in 403, 21, Wülker failed to understand that *fiscalis ræde* is Latin=*fiscalis rhedæ*, which is explained *gafellicum wænfare* (as he ought to have known from 22, 17) and so Hall entered, however, without citing his authority: *rædegafol*, sn., 'rent paid in one payment (in money or kind);' that is to say, from a mere blunder of Wülker he coined a new word to enrich his dictionary. Just so 357, 32, Wülker had not been aware of the fact that two glosses had been crowded on one line; namely, *bapys treuteru*, and *ban segn*, although 8, 30 *ban segn*, and 8, 31 *bapis treuteru*, ought to have led him to a proper understanding of the situation. From 357, 32, his great authority Bosworth-Lye had guessed that *treuteru* (='tree-tar') must signify 'a sort of standard,' and this he imparts to his readers in the note to 8, 31. Now, that Hall did not fall into the trap, he simply owes to Sweet's correctly explaining *treuteru*, but from 357, 32 he gets the entry *bansegn*, sm., 'interest on money, money lent on interest,' which is taken from 515, 1 *fenus hiereborg*. It is evident from 237, 37 that we have to divide *hiere borg*; as to *hiere*, it is likely it

stands for *hiera;* cf. 440, 11; 442, 4; 508, 1. WW. 130, 15 we meet with that monster of a word *geldhealhalgung,* explaining Latin 'ceremonia uel orgia.' Hall, not understanding it, bodily transferred it. But a look at 107, 22 ought to have resolved him the riddle into the three words *geld, (h)eal halgung,* that is, 'guild (cf. the broad meaning of Danish 'Gilde,') every sort of hallowing=feast, every sort of festal day' (cf. 519, 17, etc.).

It did not occur to Hall to glance at 471, 18: *per cola þurh sticceo,* before he entered: *þurh-sticcian,* wv., 'to strain through, filtrate, percolate,' from 487, 16; or to remember that there is such a word as: *tælg,* 'dye,' before he transferred from 513, 2 the blunder: *'geælged,* colored,' into his book; or that *telg* and *deag* are two separate words meaning the same thing;[10] or to learn from 375, 10: *'cient hrepaδ,'* that his entry *hrewaδ,* taken from 533, 2, is a blunder for: *'hrepaδ*=they call.'

Very interesting is it to trace the way he came by the following entries:

(1) '*blæcδrust,* sm., tetter, scab, leprosy (*blæc, δrust*)';

(2) '*δrut,* sb., eruption, leprosy';

(3) '*δrustfel,* sn., eruption, leprosy.'

These three entries refer to one gloss 9, 6: *bitiligo blæcthrustfel.* Sweet[11] made of that: '*þrust-fell,* sn., leprosy,' and that accounts for (3), Wülker divided it into an OE. *blæcthrust* and a Latin *fel,* and that accounts for (1); (2) is of Hall's own making, gotten up from a faint remembrance of the second component of (1). To arrive at a satisfactory understanding of the gloss in question, we must go a little deeper into the matter than Hall has done. In the *Epinal-Erfurt Glossaries*[12] the gloss is found in this form: *bitiligo blecthrust fel;* in the *Corpus Glossary,*[13] B. 103, thus: *bitiligo blæcthrust, fel;* the concurrence of manuscript evidence is then decidedly in favor of separating *fel* from *blæcthrust;* the Latin word occurs again under the letter U in the *Ep. -Erf. Gl.*[14] as: *uitilago (uitiligo) blectha,* and in the *Corp.*

10 WW. 512, 30.

11 OET., p. 520a.

12 *Corp. Gl. Lat.* v, 347, 31.

13 Ed. Hessels.

14 *Corp. Gl. Lat.* v, 399, 14.

Gl., U. 168: *uitiginem* (=*uitiliginem*) *bleci;* U. 180, *uitiligo blectha.* What is meant by *uitiligo,* becomes clear from *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* iv, 193, 40: *uitiligo macula alba corpore alfon greci et proram* (=*psoram*=$\psi\omega\rho\alpha\nu$) *uocant;*[15] *blectha* is then an exact rendering of *uitiligo*=$\dot{\alpha}\lambda\phi\acute{o}s$. We meet with this *uitiginem* (=*uitilignem*) again in Steinmeyer-Sievers, *Althochd. Gloss.,* ii. 356, 5, where it is glossed *bleci,* and as the reference there is to Orosius, i, 8: '*Sed Ægyptii cum scabiem et vitiliginem paterentur . . . . . .;* it is very likely that the above-quoted glosses owe their origin to the same author. Orosius speaks there of the plague God sent down on the Egyptians and their cattle at the instance of Moses.[16] Under these circumstances I think it probable that *blecthrust* (*blæcthrust*) is misreading or blunder for: *blec-* (*blæc*) *thrusc*= 'the white thrush, scourge (plague).' In *thrusc* (*δrusc*) I see a verbal noun of: *þrescan,* 'to scourge;'[17] the Anglo-Saxon name for this leprosy would then exactly coincide with the Hebrew word for it, which means: 'the stroke,' 'the stroke of the scourge.'[18] As to *fel,*[19] that may be the remnant of another gloss: *bilis* (*uilis*) *fel.*[20] Let us now look at the entries:

15 *Corp. Gl. Lat.* ii, 210, 2: *vituligo* $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\phi\acute{o}s$ $\alpha\lambda\omega\pi\eta\text{-}\chi\epsilon\alpha.$ A.-S. *bleci*=OHG. *pleichi.*

16 Cf. *Exod.,* 9, 9.

17 Cf. *þearsca caedere, concidere,* Lindisfarne Gospels, *Marc.,* 5, 5; 12, 5; *Luc.,* 22, 63.

18 Cf. *The Imperial Bible Dictionary, s. v.* leprosy.

19 I am well aware of the attempt that has been made to establish an OE. *þrust-fell* on the basis of Goth. *δ uts-fill* but manuscript evidence seems to be against it.

20 Cf. WW. 9, 7=*Corp. Gl.,* B. 108: *bile atr,* B. 172: *bilem amarum;* U. 195: *uilis pestis.* On the strength of such a gloss as that one might conjecture that *fel* is misreading for *wael*=*pestis.* King Ælfred uses this word when referring to the *scabiem et uitiliginem* of Orosius: *For þæm wole þe on þæt land becom, se scop wæs secgende þæt Egypti adrifen Moyses ut mid his leodum.* Orosius has: *Sed Ægypti cum scabiem et vitiliginem paterentur, eum cum aegris, ne pestis ad plures serperet, terminis Ægypti pellunt.* The form *wael* occurs in Beda, 289 (s. Sweet OET., 473a): *et cladis on wæle.* Concerning the confusion of *f* and *w,* cf. WW. 480, 1: *impetu wære*=*faere;* 254, 36: *praecipilata besceowene*=*besceofene;* 523, 38: *uoluentibus fealden dum*=*wealtendum;* 495, 20: *occa wealh*=*fealh;* 121, 17: *scarabeus scearnfifel*=*scearnwifel;* 458, 7: *occa furh, fylging, walh*=*f. f. falh.*

(1) ' *halstān*, sm., crystal (EG).'

(2) ' *healstān*, sm., small cake (WW. 364, 36 ; 372, 17 ; 495, 28).'

(3) ' *helsta*, wn ?, crust (WW. 216, 5).'

(4) ' *-hylsten*, aj., twisted (WW. 393, 31).'

It would not seem possible that every one of these words refers to exactly the same thing, and yet it is so, as Hall might have easily found out, if instead of mechanically copying from his different sources, he had examined the words before entering them. He would then have seen that Sweet's explanation ' crystal ' for (1) was based on a misunderstanding of the form *crustulla*, on record in the *Erfurt Gl.*,[21] just as if it represented a Greek κρύσταλλα, but a look into the *Corp. Gl.* (=WW. 16, 10), where the identical gloss occurs in the form *crustula similis* (=*similaginis*) *haalstan*, ought to have convinced anybody knowing Latin that the reference is to a sort of cake. Very likely the gloss is taken from *Exod.* 29, 23, where the *Vulgate* reads : *tortamque panis unius, crustulam conspersam oleo, laganum de canistro azymorum*.[21b] Having settled that, it would not have been difficult to see that WW. 216, 5 *crustula helsta uel rinde* stands for *crustula helstā=helstan u. r.*, and that *helstan* is only a variation of what we read WW. 16, 10, *haalstaan*. With that same word he would then also have identified WW. 364, 36, *colliridam healstan*, and he would also have noticed that *hylstene* occurring 393, 31, *et tortam panis* and *hylstene hlafas*, must be related to the same word and must mean ' cake, bread.' However, while it is plain enough what is meant by *haalstaan*, the etymology of the word is not so clear. Apparently the first component represents the wellknown *hál*='whole, sound,' and the second is *stán*=' stone,' and the idea suggested by such a compound may have been one of the reasons why Sweet explained it as meaning ' crystal,' for, I dare say, he

[21] OET., *Erf.*, 288.

[21b] In Ælfric's rendering of this passage: *and anne holne half mid ele gespring ende and anne gebigedne half of þara þeorfra halfa windle*, there seems to be some confusion, *holne* is evidently—*hálne* and renders *tortam—tostam*, while *gebegedne* seems to render the same word as pp. *torquere*. The passage should then read : *and anne holne hlaf oððe anne gebigedne half mid ele gesprengende and . . . . of þara þeorfra klafa windle.*

remembered that medicinal properties were ascribed to precious stones. But it seems to me, it would be hard to bridge over the gulf between the meaning ' whole-stone ' and ' cake.' I think I am justified in identifying *haal-* with *aal-*, which we have in *aal-gewerc*, ' tinder ' WW. 26, 5, *aal-fatu*, 'firepots,' 'cooking vessels ' 212, 24, ' *al-daht* (?)[22] earthen pot suitable to put on the fire for cooking.' WW. 5, 5. Then we have an easy transition of meaning, namely, *haal-staan* (1) *petra focaria* =' hearth-stone,' (2) *panis focarius* 'the bread-cake baked on the hearth stone '=Italian *focaccia*=Spanish *hogaza*=French *fouasse*= OHG. *fochanza*=MHG. *fagatze, fochenze,*= Mod. Bavarian[23] *fogetze*. Then *hylstene*[23b]= *hylstēne hlafas* is the same thing that elsewhere (WW. 153, 36) is called *heorð bacene hlafas*, and *tortam* is not participle of *torquere*, but of *torrere*, that is to say it stands for *tostam*. Concerning the form *haal* (for *aal*), I am inclined to think that there the original aspirate has been preserved, and I would connect the word with Latin *cal-or cal-ere*. That the number of forms lacking the true aspirate, is prevalent as against those exhibiting it in the same text, need not make us wonder, considering the uncertainty that very early appears in (OHG. as well as) Old-English documents in regard to what words were to be aspirated and what not. Here I should like to establish the fact that the ' ell ' of old New-England houses is really a ' hell,' that is to say, a ' fire place '=Latin *colina* (*culina*), but that would carry me too far away from my present purpose ; I must return to Hall's dictionary. I have already cited several instances of puzzling glosses being bodily transferred, just to fill the book. Here is another : *tetridit* ' desicit ' OET., p. 654. Now Sweet, OET., p. 516a, had really tried to make the

[22] For *al-ðaht, -ðoht* from *ðoh*—clay ? cf. OHG. *dáha*— (1) clay, (2) earthen pot., Also *þolle—sartago* (Mone 415,23), *fyr-ðolle—clibanum* (Mone 415, 23), seems to belong here. Nay, I am inclined to think that *al-ðaht* (*alðoht*) might read *al-ðahl* (*alðohl*).

[23] =Lagana, *Ahd. Gl.*, i, 336, 56, =*similaginem*, i, 697, 31.

[23b] *hil-hama—cicada* WW. 131, 35—*hylleshama* 378, 7 belongs here, being a counterpart of modern ' cricket-on-the-hearth,' as indeed crickets are ' little animals found in Bakers' Ovens.'

meaning of the gloss plain to him, but some-
how he seems to have failed. What he says
is : ' *te-tridit*, prs., *tramples*,' *Ef.* 344 : *tedrid-
tid* (*defecit*), cp. *desicit*. It is evident that we
have to start from the reading of the *Erfurt
Gloss.* (=*Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 356, 53) *defecit
tedridtid;* the reading of the *Corpus Gl.*,
desicit, is simply due to one of those common
confusions of the letters *f* and *s*. Now, if we
remember the phrase *tempus* (*me*) *deficit*, we
shall not hesitate to say that *tedridtid=teðrid-
tid* must stand for *teorið tid*, this ð looking so
like an *o*,[24] is the same that 487, 16 tripped up
Wülker and his docile scholar Hall. I hardly
need mention that *tempus* corresponding to
tid, has been inadvertently left out by the
copyist. From WW. 136, 27, Hall enters a
tēgung, sf., ' tincture ' =*deagung*, but is that
not rather an error for *telgung*? (cf. 277, 35 ;
517, 20, where the word is correctly exhibited).
Sweet is Hall's authority for telling us that by
the side of *tæfl* (*tefel*, *tefil*) there is such an
Old-English word as *tasol*, *tasul* for a ' die.'
If he had inquired into the matter and re-
membered Wülker's note to WW. 526, 5, he
would have seen that *tasol*, *tasul* is misread-
ing for *tafol* and *taful* corresponding to OHG.
zabul. That there is no such word as *sytle-
wæga* for ' weight, balance,' but that this is a
blunder for *lytle wæga*=' small scales,' Sievers
had already pointed out, and from Hessels'
edition of the *Corp. Glossary* he might have
learned that Sweet's *gerinen*, ptc., ' diligent '
is Latin *germen* (*Corp. Gl.*, Int. 229=Sweet
OET. cp. 24) ; and from the same source that
Sweet's *here-searu* ' war-stratagem,' is Latin
heresearum=αἱρέσεων (Hessels' *Corp. Gl.*,
Y. 6=WW. 54, 39). Nor is there any Anglo-
Saxon *rægerose*, meaning ' spinal muscles.'
The word is simply an invention of Sweet,
made up from what he found in *Erf*3. 1181
(=*Glossæ Nominum*, ed. G. Löwe, p. 58., No.
977), *inguen lesca hregresi*. The Latin word
shows plainly that the word must refer to the
genital parts, and in fact we have to read
heg-þresi=OHG. *hegadrosi* (cf. *Ahd. Gl.*, ed.

24 Accordingly we have *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 382, 50
þauD þauua in the *Erfurt Glossary*, while the *Epinal* cor-
rectly exhib'ts *þauo; Corp. Gl. Lat.*, v. 396, 20 the *Epinal*
has incorrectly *testudo borOhaca*, while the *Erfurt* exhibits
the more correct *borDthaca*.

Steinmeyer-Sievers, ii. 228, 49)=Mod. German
Hagedrüse=Leistendrüse, ' inguinal gland,'
Leistengegend, 'inguinal region ;' *lesca*, which
Sweet considered to be Latin,[25] is identical
with the *leosca* 'groin' (Hall took from Kluge's
Etym. Wörterb. d. deutsch. Spr.)=ME. *leske*
=OSw. *ljuske*=Dan. *lyske* and is the ground-
word of the verb *be-lisnian* (=*be-liscnian*), *be-
listnian*, ' to emasculate, castrate,' which he
took from WW. 106, 31 ; the word occurs also
in the Anglo-Saxon Translation of the Gos-
pels, Matt. 19, 12 : *belistnode eunuchizati*.
Just as imaginary as the above-quoted word
for ' spinal muscles,' is the entry *neweseoða*,
wm., ' pit of stomach.' The passages on
which Sweet, OET., p. 619a, based his new
coinage are *Epinal Gl.*, 505 (=*Corp. Gl. Lat.*,
v. 365, 43) *ilium neuũ seada=Erf. næensida*,
*Erf*3. 1180 : *ilium neisn næensood* (=*Gloss.
Nom.*, p. 52, No. 852). Comparing such
glosses as WW. 26, 6 : *ilia midhridir, nioðan
weard hype;* 159, 36 : *ilium scare*; 159, 37 :
ilia smæle þearmas; 427, 28 : *ilium rysle*; 419,
9 : *ilibus smæl þearmum;* 517, 14 : *ilia inneþas*
with Hessels' *Corp. Gl.*, E. 439 : *exta iesen*[26]
(=WW. 20, 24, where Wülker wrongly ex-
hibits *lesen*); WW. 521, 33 : *exta iesendne*,

25 Sure enough, there is a Greek-Latin word *ischion*
(=ἰσχίον), the plural form of which *ischia*, written *iscia*
(cf. *Corpus Glossariorum Lat.*, iii, 409, 61, *lumbi iscia*)
might be hidden in ii, 333. 39 ἰσχίον *dossum lumba lesca*
(=t esca, t iscia), but this conjecture seems superfluous in
view of the fact that ME. has *leske*= ' groin,' and the Anglo-
Saxon translation of the Gospels records a verb clearly point-
ing to a noun *lisca*. Perhaps we have to do with this *iscia*
ἰσχία in the puzzling gloss on record in the *Epinal-Erfurt
Glossaries* (*Corp. Gl. Lat.*, v, 367, 27) *isca tyndirm-tyndrin;*
as the gloss following is *ign(i)arium algiuueorc-algiuerc*,
it seems likely that *tyndirm* belongs as a synonym to
algiuueorc ('tinder, kindling wood') and has crowded out the
proper interpretation of *isca=iscia*, namely *lesca*, which
could the more easily drop out, as a very similar gloss
preceded; namely *isic*=(ἰσόξ) *leax-lex* 'salmon.' As to the
form *tyndirm* on record here, Sweet OET., p. 570a, does not
take any cognizance of it, but it is the same formation as
waestm (=*waestma*) from *waest*, or *aecilma* from *aecil* (*egl*).

26 Here belongs also, I believe, the *iesne lĩea=servus* of
Prolog. Matth. North. Gosp. Matth., 19, 22: *ðe esne=*
adolescens (hence correct WW. 77, 40 : *adolescens iunges*
into *iungēs=iung esn*), and *esnecund condictiorius* for ex-
ample, *conductionarius*, WW. 212, 401. Hall did not un-
derstand it, and so bodily transferred it ; it means, of course,
'a { thing / man } belonging to (or dealing with) the class of (hired)
servants' (cf. also *innheardmonn* 'miles,' Matth. 8, 9, Lin-
disf. Gosp.).

isend; 396, 22 *extis iesende oððe inelfe; Lorica Gloss.*, 71 (=Sweet, p. 172): *intestinis isernum=isennum* and *Ahd. Gloss*, ii. 374. 37: *rien, testiculus niero,* I think, we shall be justified in supposing that *neisn* stand for *nĕ-isn=ner-isn,* that is to say, *nĕ* (=*nen* for *ner*) was copied from a manuscript where *n* and *r* were nearly alike in form, just as *næn-sood* stands for *nær-sood* and *nenŭ seada* for *neru-seada*; *sood* I consider to be a by-form of *sád* '*laqueus*,[27] *extale.*' The meaning of *ilium ner-isn nær-sood, neru-seada* is then 'the reins.'

<div align="right">OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.</div>

Hartford High School.

NOCH—ITS ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS AND THE RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF THEIR OCCURRENCE.

IN preparing a vocabulary of the most common words in simple German, I have had occasion to give some special attention to the particle *noch.* It occurs about 840 times in the following seven Readers: Brandt's, Bronson's (*German Prose and Poetry*, both parts), Buchheim's (both parts), Fasnacht's (first year), Harris', Joynes-Meissner's, and Whitney's (*Introductory*). Of these 840 cases, only about 50 belong to verse, the rest to prose. *Noch* as a temporal adverb occurs about 530 times; as an adverb of degree, measure, etc., 310 times. But it is often difficult to distinguish these two categories clearly. In the latter I have also included 24 cases of *noch* meaning 'nor,' which is in reality a different etymon.

I have put the 840 cases into four general groups and numbered the subdivisions consecutively from 1 to 37. Groups *A, B* and *C* contain the 530 cases of *noch* as an adverb of time; Group *D*, all others. Group *A* comprises about 300 cases of *noch* as referring to the present and to the past, the majority 179 uninfluenced by other adverbs; Group *B,* about 100 cases of *noch*+a negative, its most common modifier: and Group *C,* about 130 cases of *noch* as pointing forward to the future, relative or absolute. This classification is neither strictly logical, nor historical; it merely

[27] Cf. *Corp. Gl. Lat.* ii. 66, 47: *extalis* αρχος=ὁρχός that is, *testiculus.*

aims at some practical results for purposes of translation.

GROUP *A.*

Whether *noch* in this group shall be rendered by 'still 'or by 'yet,' may often be left to individual choice. In general, however, it seems safe to say that 'still' is more in harmony with present Eng. usage. [Consult on this point a *Shakespere Concordance* and Schmidt's *Shakespere Lexicon* and notice that 'still' was then often='constantly'; also: Young's *Bible Concordance*, where the use of 'yet' predominates and 'still' is registered only about half a dozen times.]

1. *Noch* with present and perfect tenses —96 times: (*a*) die Suppe ist noch etwas heiss, 'still'; (*b*) ich sehe sie noch alle deutlich vor mir, als wenn es erst heute geschehen wäre, 'still,' but cf. the use of 'yet' in *Cent. Dict.* s.v. *yet* i, 3; (*c*) "wollt ihr das?" "wie könnt ihr noch fragen?" (Brandt, 24. 14), 'is that still a question?' (*d*) wer es am meisten nötig hat, das wäre noch eine grosse Frage, lit. 'would still be a great question,' say: 'is at least very doubtful,' cf. *noch*='at least,' *D.* 37; (*e*) wissen Sie noch, was ich Ihnen neulich sagte? lit. 'do you still know . . . ?' say simply: 'do you remember what . . . ?'; (*f*) er hebt seine Stimme jetzt so hoch, wie er noch kann (Whitney, 171, 5), 'as his strength still allows,' or, 'enables him,' or 'as he possibly could;' (*g*) wenn ich auch alle Schätze der Welt habe, so habe ich doch noch allerlei Wünsche, 'I have, for all that, all sorts of wishes still'; (*h*) die paar Stunden, die noch übrig sind, 'which are still left,' or simply, 'which remain': (*i*) aber meint ihr nicht, wir könnten noch entkommen? (Bronson i. 179. 3), 'still,' that is, now as well as a while ago, or, 'even now'; 'yet' would more likely refer to some time or other in the future (see *C.* 22), which is not meant by this emphatic *noch;* (*k*) noch ist es Zeit, dass ich gehe (cf. Brandt 168.19), like (*i*) above, or say, 'it isn't too late yet for me to go,' and supply, 'but it will soon be too late'; (*l*) noch ist er verwundert über alles, was er hier sieht (Brandt, 122.23), 'he is still surprised'. . ., or, in order to intimate more clearly that his wonder is expected to cease, say, 'as yet he is . . .,' cf.

Standard Dict., s.v. *yet,* the two examples: 'he is still feeble' and 'he is feeble yet.'

Here may also be classed: um nicht von dem jungen Fant übersprungen zu werden, der noch mein Schüler gewesen ist (Harris, 156.19). Harris translates: 'besides,' which in German, however, would quite as likely be expressed by *noch dazu,* see *D.* 28. The idea seems to be: 'who is still so young as to have been my pupil,' or 'who only lately was my pupil.'

2. *Noch* with past or historical tenses and denoting either—(*a*) to (*c*)—a period, also a point, of time in the past (Grimm, s.v. *noch* i, 3), or—(*d*) to (*k*)—continuation of time from the past down to the present, absolute or relative (Grimm, i, 2)—83 times: (*a*) während sie noch sprachen, 'while they were still speaking'; cf. 'while he yet spake, behold a bright cloud' Matth., 17. 5, and *Cent. Dict. yet,* i, 3; (*b*) in Aegypten, wohin ich noch sehr jung geschickt wurde, 'while still very young;' (*c*) am andern Morgen waren die Segel noch aufgerollt, 'still furled'; (*d*) ein Sensenmann hat mir abgehauen, was von der Hand noch übrig war, say 'what little there was left,' cf. *A.* 1 (*h*); (*e*) sie kommen zurück mit Pferden, die sich kaum noch schleppen können, say, 'which had scarcely strength enough left to drag themselves along'; (*f*) nur der Ankläger fehlte noch, (Harris, 142. 9), 'only the accuser was still wanting,' 'still failed to put in appearance,' or negatively, 'did not yet appear;' (*g*) fliegen konnten sie nicht gut, denn sie hatten noch wenig Übung, 'for as yet they had had but little practice,' cf. *A,*1 (*l*), or negatively, 'they had not yet had much practice,' cf. 'not yet,' *B.*10. Here, again, the use of 'yet' points more to a future time when they might possibly get the necessary practice; (*h*) dazu war ich noch fremd in der Gegend und kannte den Wald noch gar wenig (Joynes-M. 116. 69). The first *noch* does not modify *dazu,* as in *noch dazu* (*D.* 28), but *war ich,* just as the second modifies *kannte,* but *dazu alone* has here the same force as *noch dazu* in *D.* 28; (*i*) so that sie es immer seltner, und zuletzt kam es kaum noch vor, dass auch nur von dem Ringe gesprochen wurde (Harris, 55. 5), 'she did it less and less frequently, and' lit. 'finally it hardly still occurred,' or, 'it would

hardly occur any more that the ring was even, or 'even so much as mentioned;' (*k*) ich fand noch alles, wie ich es verlassen, logically not 'I. still found everything as I had left it,' but rather, 'I found everything still as I had left it,' that is, 'everything was still in the same condition in which I had left it.'

3. *Noch+immer,* or, *immer+noch,* with present and past tenses, 'all the time,' 'even now,' 'even then,' often simply=an emphatic 'still'—41 times: (*a*) noch immer wurden mehr Ballen aus dem Schiffe herausgewälzt (Joynes-M., 98, 38), 'all the time they went on rolling'; (*b*) er war nicht ohne Sorge darüber, dass die Hilfstruppen noch immer ausblieben (Brandt, 185. 20), 'still,' or, 'even then failed to appear;' (*c*) die See ist noch immer wie toll, 'even now the sea is raging violently'; (*d*) als er noch immer schwieg, fuhr der Hauptmann fort, 'when he continued to be silent'; (*e*) aber ich glaube es von Adelheid immer noch nicht, 'but I can't believe that of A. even now.'

4. *Noch+immer,* or, *immer+noch*='notwithstanding,' 'at any time,' 'at any rate,' 'still' (adversative)—4 times: (*a*) denn es ist eine eigene Sache mit dem, was richtig und was falsch ist, und schlecht Ding in guter Hand ist immer noch sehr viel mehr wert wie gut Ding in schlechter (Harris, 55. 24), 'a poor thing in good hands,' or, 'in good keeping, is still,' or, 'any day, worth much more than'; (*b*) und von diesen Jungen sterben doch noch immer viele Hungers (Fasnacht, 35. 7), 'and for all that, many of these young ones die of starvation,' say perhaps, 'insist on dying'; (*c*) thus also: *noch+allemal* instead of *noch+immer,* ich sehe noch allemal besser als dem Herrn Feldwebel lieb ist (Harris, 156. 10), 'I can still see better than you every time' or 'any day.''

5. *Noch+heute,* or, *heute+noch, noch jetzt,* etc.—30 times: (*a*) heute noch schreibe ich an ihn, 'I'll write to him this very day'; (*b*) er hat mir Gellert's Schriften noch heute gelobt, 'it's only to-day that . . .'; (*c*) ein Volksglauben, der noch heute nicht ganz erstorben, 'not even to-day,' or 'at the present day'; (*d*) ein Fieber, das noch an demselben Tage ausbrach, 'that very day,' or, 'the same day;' (*e*) kannst du das Kunststück noch jetzt? 'do

you know the trick still,' or 'now?' (emphatic); (*f*) weil ihm noch in der letzten Stunde ein Rettungsengel erschien, ' in the very last hour,' ' in the nick of time ; ' (*g*) blüht morgen dir ein Röslein auf, es welkt wohl noch die Nacht darauf, ' the very next night.'

6. *Noch+vor* or other limiting words referring to the past—17 times: (*a*) das Pferd kostete mich 50 Dukaten noch vor vier Wochen, ' only four weeks ago ; ' (*b*) ich sah ihn gestern noch durch die Strasse gehen, ' only yesterday ' ; (*c*) das sagte er noch, als er 17 Jahre alt war, ' even when he was ' ; (*d*) ich begegnete ihm noch spät abends 8 Uhr, ' as late as eight o'clock in the evening ' ; (*e*) noch am Grabe pflanzt er die Hoffnung auf, ' even at the grave.' In this and the next example the notions of time and space are blended ; (*f*) vor der Thür konnte man mich noch recht gut hören (Buchh. ii, 32. 1), ' at the door they still could understand me quite well,' that is, ' as far away as the door.'

7. *So lange noch*, generally='as long as,' or 'just as long as'—12 times: (*a*) so lange noch Gäste in der Wirtsstube sitzen, können Wirtin und Dienstboten nicht weggehen, 'as long as,' or, ' just as long as ' ; (*b*) similarly : wie lange gedenkst du noch zu leben? ' how much longer do you expect to live ? ' The *noch* in these two examples, especially in the latter, verges on that of *C ;* it points towards the future ; cf. *C.* 13, *noch lange.*

8. *Nur noch*: various equivalents—12 times: (*a*) ich spreche gar nicht mehr ; ich nicke gewöhnlich nur noch zu allem mit dem Kopf (Harris 163.9), ' all I generally do now is is to nod assent to everything ' ; (*b*) er fiel tot und ohne auch nur noch zu zucken nieder (Brandt 70. 28), ' without even so much as a quiver'; (*c*) ehe ich mich aber umsehen konnte, war dieser jemand schon vorbei, und ich sah nur noch einen Schatten an den Häusern hinschweben (Bronson ii, 39. 15), ' and all I saw was . . . ,' or, ' I just managed to see . . . ,' or, ' I all but missed seeing . . . ' ; (*d*) similarly : er hatte eben noch Zeit, wieder in das Coupé zu springen, ' was all but too late,' or, ' had just time (enough left) to . . . ' ; (*e*) similarly : die schweren Steine, die ihm allein noch hinderlich gewesen waren, ' which had been the only thing that still bothered him.'

9. *Das fehlte noch* (ironical)—3 times : sometimes a *nur* is found before the *noch*; for example: das fehlte in der That nur noch, um die Gemütlichkeit vollkommen zu machen (Harris 159. 28), ' exactly, that's just what is wanting,' or, ' that would be the last straw.'

Group *B.*

Noch with various negatives.

10. *Noch+nicht* or *nichts*, with present and past tenses—61 times: (*a*) er ist noch nicht hier ' he is'nt here yet ' ; (*b*) noch ist es nicht geschehen, ' it has not been done as yet,' or, ' so far it hasn't been done ' ; (*c*) ich glaube gar, die langen Fransen sind noch nicht einmal gewechselt (Harris 161. 16), ' haven't even been changed yet ' ; (*d*) ich habe ihn noch gar nicht gesehn, to be translated according to context and emphasis ; if with greater emphasis on *gar* than on *gesehen* : ' I haven't seen him at all ' ; if with a greater emphasis on *gesehen* than on *gar* : ' I haven't seen him ' ; (*e*) geh, aber jetzt noch nicht, ' go, but not yet,' or, ' not now ' ; (*f*) ich bin ein Original ; das kann ich ohne Eitelkeit sagen ; aber darum sage ich noch nicht, dass ich ein gutes Original bin (Harris 120, 21), ' but I do not go so far as to say that,' or, ' but that does not mean that'; (*g*) als sie sah dass noch nichts gesponnen war, ' that nothing had yet been spun ; ' (*h*) mein Bruder wusst' es noch nicht, ' didn't know it at the time,' or, ' at that time' ; (*i*) solcher Schimpf war dem Kaiser noch nicht geschehen, ' not yet,' or, ' never yet.'

11. *Noch lange nicht*—twice : (*a*) sie hatte sich noch lange nicht erholt, ' she was still far from having recovered,' or, ' she was not yet ' (or ' by no means ') restored ' ; (*b*) wir atmeten freier, aber unsere Angst hatte noch lange kein Ende, ' our anxiety was by no means yet over.'

12. *Noch+ kein*, with present and past tenses, ' not before,' ' never yet,' ' not before ' ' never before'—19 times: (*a*) du hast mir noch keine Antwort darauf gegeben, ' you haven't answered my question yet ' ; (*b*) noch habe ich kein Wort von dir gehört, ' I haven't yet heard a word from you ' ; (*c*) auch mich hat, wie Sie, bis jetzt noch kein harter Schlag betroffen (Joynes-M. 141. 10), ' before this no

great bereavement has befallen either you or me'; (*d*) Herr, diesen Fisch hab' ich gefangen, wie keiner noch ins Netz gegangen, 'such as I never saw in my net before'; (*e*) ein Haus wie er noch keins gesehen hatte, 'such as he had never seen before.'

13. *Noch*+*nie* (*niemals*), 'never yet'—14 times: bei seinem Barte hatte ja der Kaiser noch nie geschworen, ohne, . . ., 'for the emperor had never yet sworn by his beard without . . .'

GROUP C.

In *A* and *B*, the force of *noch* did not extend beyond the present into the future (with the possible exception of 7). It will now be seen that the examples of *C* point by degrees more and more to the future, as we begin with 13 and end with 22.

14. *Noch*+*lange, lange Zeit, eine Stunde, ein Jahr, ein bischen*, and other limiting words indicating continuation from the past, through the present, into the future, relative or absolute—33 times: (*a*) sie besprachen sich noch lange über die Geschichte, 'for a long time still,' 'much longer'; (*b*) der Adler schwebte lange noch über dem Haupte des Bauers, like (*a*); (*c*) so lebte er noch ein paar Tage fort, 'thus he lived on for a few days longer'; (*d*) ich für meinen Teil habe lieber mein Pferd in dieser Schenke eingestellt, als dass ich nur noch eine Stunde weiter geritten wäre (Bronson i. 173.8), 'than ride even so much as an hour's journey further'; (*e*) eine Woche will ich's noch mit ansehen, dann aber . . . (Harris 171. 2), 'I'll try to stand it one week longer (or 'still'), but after that : . .'; (*f*)Hermann begleitete die Römer noch eine Strecke (Brandt 186. 14), 'for a distance still'; 'a little further still'; (*g*) sie tranken noch bis tief in die Nacht hinein, 'they continued drinking till late into the night.' Cf. the use of *yet* in: 'for *yet* a little while and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry,' Heb. 10. 37; also John 7. 33.

15. *Noch* without limiting word. The continuation of time from the past, as well as the extension into the future, are more or less evident from the context—30 times: (*a*) sprach zum Richter: gewährt mir noch eine Bitte, 'grant me still one request,' *noch*=(1) 'while

we continue to be together,' or 'while there is time,' and (2) 'before I am hanged.' The English seems to emphasize (1) rather than (2); the German (2) rather than (1); (*b*) 45 Jahre ist kein Alter. Er muss noch schreiben, für die Welt leben (Harris 121. 23), 'still write,' 'go on writing'; (*c*) du hast noch einen langen Weg vor dir, 'you have still a long distance before you'; 'yet' would seem rather more emphatic than necessary.

Here *noch* often verges on the *noch*='more' (*D*. 26): (*a*) eine Nachricht muss ich Ihnen noch melden (Harris 122. 25), *noch* rather= 'before I finish my letter,' than='one more piece of news;' (*e*) ich habe dir noch viel zu erzählen (Harris 175. 7), 'I have much to tell you still,' or, 'much more.' The context only will decide in such cases which is the better rendering, and often the difference is very slight.

At other times again the *noch* approaches the meaning of 'at some indefinite time in the future,' (*C*. 22): (*f*) es scheint, das wir noch zu einem vollständigen Urteil kommen können (Brandt 179. 20), that we may yet reach . . .,' that is, 'if we only keep on with our investigation.' But *noch* may here also be='even now,' 'late as it is,' or 'before every opportunity of collecting evidence is cut off'; or translate 'that it is not yet too late to . . .' A good example to show the different points of view that may sometimes be taken in the interpretation of *noch*.

16. The time of this *noch*, which points more or less clearly to the future, is sometimes represented as coinciding with, or immediately following, that of another action— 6 times: (*a*) als er aber zum Galgen abgeführt wurde, schrie ihm noch der Jude nach, 'the Jew still cried out after him,' that is, (1) 'while they led him away,' and (2) 'before he was quite out of sight.' Notice that the *noch* here might be transposed to the other clause: aber noch als . . .; (*b*) a stage direction: durch die Mitte ab, nachdem sie im Vorbeieilen Cäsar noch einen Kuss gegeben hat (Harris 167. 24), not 'another kiss,' but 'after stopping to give Cæsar a hasty kiss as she passes.'

17. The fact that *noch* refers to the future, or rather limits the time of an action to a period which closes with the beginning of

another action or event, is often clearly indicated by such words as *bevor*, *vor*, etc.,—6 times: (*a*) bevor er Wien verliess, beehrte ihn die Kaiserin noch mit einer Unterredung, 'the Empress honored him . . .' The same transposition is here possible as in 15. (*a*); (*b*) er sagte, ich müsste ihm noch vor der Abreise was spielen, 'must still play,' that is, 'while I was with him,' or 'during my visit,' and 'before leaving him.' Although the English often need not translate the *noch*, the student should nevertheless feel the force of it in the German.

18. More frequently the limitation mentioned 17 above, expressed by *ehe: ehe+noch*, *noch+ehe*, *ehe . . . noch*, 'before,' or 'even before'—20 times: (*a*) aber ehe der Kaiser noch Zeit hatte, seinen Retter zu betrachten, war dieser bereits verschwunden; (*b*) we also have *noch* and *ehe* in different clauses: wenn ihr meinen Rat folgt, so kann ich euch noch freimachen, ehe es zu spät ist.

19. In this section and in 20 and 21, the *noch* points also clearly to the future, but the limitation is to be inferred from the context, and various free English translations are possible—3 times: (*a*) nicht weit von der Stadt zieht sich ein Vorgebirge in das Meer. Dorthin wollten noch die Mädchen, um von da die Sonne in das Meer sinken zu sehen (Bronson ii, 55. 18), *noch*='before they were rowed back,' 'before they returned,' or say: 'thither they wished to extend their excursion'; (*b*) der Hahn sagte, es scheine dort ein Licht. Sprach der Esel: So müssen wir uns aufmachen und noch hingehen, denn hier ist die Herberge schlecht (Bronson, i, 52. 26), 'go thither before we go to sleep,' or 'go thither, late as it is'; or also: 'continue our journey till we reach the light'; (*c*) der Lotsenkommandeur wundert sich, aber er geht hin und schliesst die Thür; und mein Bruder sieht noch, dass in der andern Stube Theodor auf dem Bett sitzt (Whitney, 173. 12), 'before he actually closed the door,' or 'just managed to see that,' or 'all but missed seeing that'; cf. *A.* 8. *d.*

20. *Noch*='first'—12 times: (*a*) er war entschlossen, die Schwester aufzusuchen, aber er wollte sich nur noch den Segen des Vaters erbitten (Bronson ii, 57. 9); (*b*) etwas muss ich aber noch gestehen, was mir auch nicht wenig Geld einbrachte, ich nahm meine Arzneikunst zu Hilfe (Bronson ii, 37. 10), 'first,' that is, 'before I go on with my story'; (*c*) endlich aber wurde der Vater mit seinen Sachen in den Korbwagen geschafft, nachdem er noch einige Male um den Wagen herumgegangen war (Brandt 118. 26), not 'several times more,' but 'after he had first . . .' and 'before he actually got in'; (*d*) sometimes the translation by 'first' is plainly suggested by *erst noch*: ach, nicht erst noch schmieren! (Brandt 218. 3) 'oh don't stop to limber me up first!'

21. *Noch*='in time,' 'at the last moment' —6 times: (*a*) er holte eben so schnell auch noch seinen Kameraden (Bronson i, 74. 18), 'and just as quickly he also fetched his comrade in time,' or 'before it was too late,' 'in the nick of time;' (*b*) vielleicht kann die Gräfin vergessen, was ich ihr schnell noch sagte (Bronson i, 204. 28), 'what I said to her at the last moment' and 'before parting.'

22. In the examples in this section, *noch* refers with great clearness to the future and occurs, therefore, exclusively with the future tense (or the present used in its place); but in point or period of time is much less definitely limited than in the preceding sections. It is in these cases that the use of *yet*, as in: 'he'll be hanged *yet*' (Shak.) is eminently in place. Often *noch*='at some time or other'—18 times: (*a*) Zinnsoldat, du wirst dir noch die Augen aussehen; (*b*) dein Männchen kennt nur die Sammetpfötchen: du wirst die Krallen schon noch herausstrecken (Whitney 216. 13), 'I am sure, he'll yet be made to feel your claws'; (*c*) wer weiss, was noch kommt?

This is the last example of *noch* as a temporal adverb. Its range extends from a distant past, for example: sie waren noch nie besiegt worden, to a distant future, for example: das wird in Europa auch noch Mode werden.

Group *D*.

Noch as an adverb of degree, measure, etc.

23. *Noch* with comparatives, 'still' or 'yet' —82 times: (*a*) da war es noch schlimmer als unter der Rinnsteinbrücke; (*b*) "Die Geschichte ist Ihnen wohl zu Herzen gegan-

gen?'' "Mehr noch als den anderen Herren,' (Whitney 176. 16), 'more even than'; (*c*) die ehernen Stiere waren noch viel böser und stärker als wirkliche Stiere; (*d*) here may also be classed: aber ich hätte noch ganz was anderes zu erzählen (Brandt 81. 27), 'something much more remarkable still.'

24. *Nur noch* with comparatives, 'only all the '+comparative—3 times: (*a*) er hielt sein Gewehr nur noch fester, ' only all the more firmly'; (*b*) seine Verkleidung brachte ihn nur noch mehr in Gefahr, 'only brought him into all the greater danger,' or, ' was far from making the danger of his situation less.'

25. *Noch* and *auch noch*, 'besides,' 'moreover,' 'also,' 'in addition,' ' else '—34 times: (*a*) das Auditorium war so voll, dass ein Vorsaal und noch die Flur bis an die Hausthür besetzt war (Buchheim ii, 31. 21); (*b*) die elfte Arbeit war noch mit einer ganz besondern Schwierigkeit verbunden, 'involved moreover a quite peculiar difficulty'; (*c*) so ein Schwein, das schmeckt anders, dabei noch die Würste, 'and then all the sausages besides,' or, ' in addition,' or ' not to speak of all the sausages '; (*d*) er schloss die Läden, damit niemand etwas sähe, riegelte dann auch noch die Thür hinter sich zu (Harris 52. 6), *auch noch*='in addition,' but the *noch* might also be='before doing anything else,' that is, 'before expressing his wish,' cf. *C.* 15; (*e*) Hans dankte Gott, dass er ihm auch diese Gnade noch erwiesen hätte, 'that he had even granted him this favor also,' 'in addition to all the others'; (*f*) sie fragten mich, wass ich denn noch zu thun hätte, 'what more,' or ' what else I had to do;' (*g*) er wusste nicht, wohin er sich noch verbergen könne (Harris 36. 14), 'where else he should hide himself.'

26. *Noch+viel, manch, einig, wenig*, etc. —15 times: (*a*) es werden ihrer noch viele kommen, 'many more,' 'many others'; (*b*) es kostete noch einige Mühe, ihn heraufzubringen (Brandt 92. 19), 'some further trouble'; (*c*) lege noch etwas Holz an (that is, ans Feuer), 'a little more'; (*d*) also *noch*+common noun: einen Gruss noch rief der Held der Geliebten zu (Brandt 65. 3), 'one more greeting'; but here, as well as in *D.* 25. (*d*), the *noch* might be be: 'before departing.'

27. *Sonst noch*—8 times: (*a*) und was du

sonst noch hast 'and whatever else you may have'; (*b*) fragte, ob er nicht sonst noch zu Diensten sein könne, 'in other respects,' 'in other ways'; (*c*) und sonst noch allerlei Putz und Zieraten, 'many other kinds of.'

28. *Noch dazu, noch obendrein*, 'besides all that,' 'to boot,' 'and even'—7 times: (*a*) sie wies einen nach dem andern ab und trieb noch dazu Spott mit ihnen, 'and even ridiculed them'; (*b*) er bot ihm viel Geld und versprach noch obendrein, ihm eine weit grössere Mühle bauen zu lassen, 'and went so far as to promise.'

29. *Noch einmal*, 'once more,' 'again'—66 times: (*a*) noch einmal eilt Siegfried zu seinem trauten Weib; (*b*) er ist noch einmal hier gewesen, 'again.'

Here may also be classed eight cases in which higher numerals than *ein* are used before *mal*: (*c*) wenn ich mich recht auseinanderthue, bin ich noch dreitausendmal so dick, say 'three thousand times as thick as before'; (*d*) ich habe in späteren Jahren noch hundertmal derlei erlebt, 'time and again,' 'again and again.'

30. *Noch ein*, 'another,' 'longer' — 26 times; (*a*) rechts ist noch ein Zimmer, 'another'; (*b*) das Stümpchen Licht kann kaum noch eine Viertelstunde dauern (Bronson i. 180. 11), 'another quarter of an hour,' or 'a quarter of an hour longer'; (*c*) er hätte gern noch einen letzten Versuch gemacht, 'another, and a final, attempt.'

31. *Noch ein anderer*, 'another not yet mentioned or considered'—6 times: (*a*) nun warb aber noch ein anderer Freier um Gudrun (Harris 202. 15); (*b*) drei Buben und zwei Mädchen, zu denen oft noch andere Gespielen aus der Nachbarschaft kamen (Brandt 89. 13), 'three boys and two girls (who were playmates and), who were sometimes joined by other playmates (still) from the neighborhood.'

32. *Weder . . . noch*, 'neither . . . nor '—15 times: er hatte weder gegessen, noch getrunken.

33. *Noch*, without *weder*, after a negative or privative in preceding clause, 'neither . . . nor,' 'nor'—9 times: (*a*) ich kann euch nicht belügen, noch betrügen (Harris 207. 10); (*b*) nie Saite, noch Gesang; (*c*) ohne Schnauze, noch Füsse nass zu machen, 'without wetting

either mouth or feet,' or 'wetting neither mouth, nor feet.'

34. *Noch,* 'even,' 'yet,' 'and what is more than that'—14 times: (*a*) Andreas noch in Banden frei (Brandt 139. 5), 'even,' or 'though in fetters, yet free'; (*b*) und noch im Netze gab der Fisch den Laut von sich (Buchheim i. 43. 12), 'even while in the net'; (*c*) die Wirtin gab ihr einen alten Rock und ein Paar wollene Strümpfe; dabei that sie noch, als wär's ein grosses Geschenk (Bronson i. 76. 16), 'gave her . . . stockings; and mean though they were, she even pretended that . . .,' or 'even acted as if . . .'.

35. *Noch einmal so* . . ., 'twice as . . .,' 'as . . . again'—once: sässe doch das kleine Mädchen hier im Boote, dann könnte es getrost noch einmal so finster sein (Brandt 29. 4), 'as dark again.'

36. *Noch so* . . ., 'never so . . .'—18 times; (*a*) was hilft es, dass ich noch so gesund aussehe(Joynes-M. 134.28), 'look never so well'; on 'never so' and 'ever so' cf. Webster's *Internat. Dict.* s. v. *never;* on the relation of *noch so* to *noch einmal so* (35 above) cf. Grimm, *Wb.* s.v. *noch,* ii, 2.

37. *Noch,* 'at least,' 'possibly'—5 times: (*a*) auch diese Hoffnung fehlgeschlagen! das Hausmädchen hätte vielleicht noch etwas gewusst (Brandt 166. 19), 'it might have been that the servant girl at least had known something,' that is, even if the mistress could not be expected, or, was sure not, to know anything about cooking; (*b*) wenn ich noch einen Explosionsstoff entdeckt hätte (Harris 168.24), 'at least.' Compare with this: wär's noch die kaiserliche Kron! Zo ist's der Hut von Oesterreich, *Tell* 408, 'if it were at least the emperor's crown! as it is,' or, 'now, it is the hat of A.,' where Deering translates 'only,' which is ambiguous; also *Neffe als Onkel* ii,9, fin. ja, wenn ich noch wenigstens ein Glas zu viel getrunken hätte—Aber so!; here the *wenigstens* is expressed, but the meaning would remain the same if it were left out. Cf. *A.* 2 (*h*) where *noch=noch dazu;* also *C.* 20 (*d*), where *noch=erst noch.*

Here may also be classed: freilich, die Zeit kann aus den Menschen noch was machen (ironical; Brandt 98. 15), that is, 'if all other things or powers cannot, Time, at least, can make something out of a fellow.' But this might possibly be : 'Time in the end, can . . .,' that is, if you only wait long enough; or, 'Time will yet make . . .,' *C.* 22.

A similar notion of a least, or lowest degree is implied in : das ist noch gnädig genug abgegangen (Harris 160. 11); in other words : ich nenne das noch gnädig, d.h. noch nicht ungnädig oder unglücklich, denn es hätte schlimmer werden können, 'I call that lucky (enough) still,' or, 'it might have been worse,' or 'it went better than I thought it would.'

The following summary shows at a glance which of the English equivalents occur most frequently and are hence the most important for the student to learn.

A.		B.		C.		D.	
1	96	10	61	14	33	23	82
2	83	11	2	15	30	24	3
3	41	12	19	16	6	25	34
4	4	13	14	17	6	26	15
5	30		—	18	20	27	8
6	17		96	19	3	28	7
7	12			20	12	29	66
8	12			21	6	30	36
9	3			22	18	31	6
	—				—	32	15
	298				134	33	9
						34	14
						35	1
						36	8
						37	5
							—
							309

CONRAD BIERWIRTH.

Harvard University.

THE OLD-ENGLISH RUNES FOR *a* AND *o.*

It is well known that the Old-English runes ᚪ ᚫ ᚩ represented the three sounds *æ a o,* and ᚫ ᚩ are generally regarded as modifications of ᚠ made by the addition of diacritical marks in order to secure differentiated symbols. But if ᚠ had continued as the sign for the three sounds that arose out of Germanic

a until it occurred to some one that it was not well so, and that it would be better to differentiate them, we should be justified in asking why it was that *æ* rather than one of the others was allowed to retain the original sign; and, if it was, why one stroke was added to *a* and two strokes to *o*; and why these additional strokes were not attached to the other side of the stems, rather than clumsily hung on the projections to the right. Besides it would seem strange, if these forms were due to an arbitrary interference of this kind, that the same new forms were hit upon by most writers or that one man's choice became general convention.

We are therefore led to look for something in the language itself that guided most writers independently to the same or similar forms and thus established the new usage. It is my purpose to show that the younger letters were not arbitrary creations but natural developments; that the two did not arise at the same time; and that they probably stood originally not for either long or short *a* and *o* but for *ā* and *ǫ* only.

When Germanic *a* became Old-English *æ*, such a word as *asc* ᚠᛋᚳ became *æsc*, but as it continued to be written ᚠᛋᚳ , the rune ᚠ acquired the value *æ* by the side of that of *a*. On the other hand, as Germanic *aɪ* gradually blended into the one sound *ā*, the two runic symbols for *aɪ*; namely ᚠᛁ, gradually blended into a ligature something like ᚼ , out of which grew the two common forms ᚠ and ᚱ (cf. the change of Greek *αι* > *α*, as the diphthong became the long vowel *ā*, and the similar change of Latin *æ* > *æ* > *ę*); and thus with the new *ā*-sound, a new symbol arose, which doubtless was soon used also for the *ā* that had not arisen out of *aɪ*. There were then—not yet two runes—but two forms of the same rune: one for short *a* and *æ* and one for long *a* (and for *ǣ*?). But it was natural that, as in the case of the other vowels, both long and short *a* should in time be expressed by the same sign; in this way ᚠ came to stand for *æ* only, and ᚱ for *a* as well as *ā*, and thus a new rune was established. This very early stage in the development of the Old-English language is preserved in the inscription on the Collingham cross (Stephens, ii, 390; iii, 183):—

æftar Answini cu(ning).[1]

From the use here made of ᚠ and ᚱ we see that the change of *a* to *æ* and that of *aɪ* to *ā* had taken place, but that *a* (perhaps nasalized) still stood before nasal and fricative. For it is ᚱ *a* not ᚹ *o*, as Stephens gives it and as others have copied; cf. Stephens' own figure of the stone (ii, 391) and the report of Haigh (Stephens iii, 183).[2]

In time the old *an* before a voiceless fricative became nasalized *ǫ*, and later *ō*; and the symbols ᚠᚼ, or ᚹ (cf. the later similar writing on the Franks casket, Stephens ii, 470, Wülker, *Bib. Angl. Poesie* i, etc.), gradually blended into a ligature something like ᚼ or ᚹ, out of

[1] This exceedingly valuable inscription (whose date we know, Oswin having been killed in 651) shows still other antique peculiarities; for example, the Germanic form of the *c*-rune, namely ᚲ ; the *a* in *æftar*, and the *u* in *cuning*, either not yet mutated or with mutation not yet expressed. —Since writing this article I have received Vietor's *Northumbrische Runen*, from which it is evident that the Collingham cross has weathered badly since then seen by Stephens, Haigh, etc. Vietor reads:—ÆFT(ÆR ÆRþ)SWI(HUN), but is uncertain about what is in ( ), quite so about HUN. Vietor's photographs of the monument are unfortunate, the left side being perfectly black and the right illegible. The two distinct black strokes of the first rune on the right (which make it look like ᚠ rather than ᚱ)are evidently the work of the retoucher's pencil or of accidental scratches on the negative.—

Of about the same age is the inscription on the Shropshire beads (Stephens iii, 160), which Stephens reads : ᛁ ᚦ ᛁ ᚱᚦᚦᚦ ᚠ ᚷ, and which also shows ᚲ ,ᚠ , and ᚱ , and whose ᚷ is probably still unmutated. So also the inscription on the coin in the British Museum (Stephens ii, 879 and lxviii ; Wimmer 87):—

$$\text{ᚦᛁᚠᛏᚱᛗᚷᛝᚾ}$$
scanomodu;

for here, too, we find ᚱ , but ᚷ is still *o*. The ᛁ for *c* (cf. the the Lindholm inscription, Stephens iii, 33) ¹s one of the intermediate stages between ᚲ and the usual Old-English ᛕ (Wimmer 87); the form of the *s*-rune is very antique. It will also be observed that the *o* of the first member and final *u* after the long syllable had not yet disappeared.

[2] Haigh wrote *æftar answini*, which Stephens misprints *æfter auswini*.

which grew the usual forms ⊬ ⊮ [3]; and thus, with a new *ō*-sound, a new symbol arose. As the old *o*-sign, ⋈, had in many cases, particularly in its very name, acquired the sound *œ*, it was natural that the new sign for *ō* should come to be used for all cases of long and short *o*.

The more or less parallel changes in the sounds and their signs may be roughly represented as follows :—

In both of these, the intermediate form alone is conjectural; and, for that matter, the intermediate forms of the sounds too are of course conjectural. Moreover, the conjectured ligatures are such as would be perfectly natural and are in character identical with other runic blendings.

At first thought one might expect that as a new character arose it would get the new name. On the contrary the old name in each case went to the new rune, and this for the simple reason that the sound of the vowel in the old name resembled that represented by the new rune more than it did that from which the latter was differentiated, and which was thus left to get a name beginning with its sound. That 'æsc' was chosen was natural: in the first place, the number of simple nouns beginning with this sound was limited, and the influence of the runic names 'beorc,' 'čēn,' and 'þorn' is obvious. But ⊬ did not get its new name until it ceased to represent both long and short *a* and stood for *æ* only, being thus recognized as a rune distinct from ⊬ , to which it resigned the old name 'ans' or 'ãns.' When this name became '*ōs*' and so no longer represented the sound of ⊬ , it became associated, as shown above, with the new character ⊮ , and ⊬ was named 'āc.' The choice of a name with *ā* < *aį* was not due to the origin of ⊬ in ⊬⎮ (which must have been quite out of

mind), but to the almost absolute lack of nouns beginning with stressed *ă* and to the analogy of 'æsc,' 'beorc,' 'čēn,' and 'þorn.' Disregarding the conjectured forms the chief stages may be represented as follows :—

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

ENGLISH LEXICOGRAPHY.

ON page vi of the introduction to *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* edited by James A. H. Murray, the following is said in regard to its aims:

"The aim of this Dictionary is to furnish an adequate account of the meaning, origin, and history of English words now in general use, or known to have been in use at any time during the last seven hundred years. It endeavours (1) to show, with regard to each individual word, when, how, in what shape, and with what signification, it became English; what development of form and meaning it has since received, which of its uses have, in the course of time, become obsolete, and which still survive, what new uses have since arisen, by what processes and when : (2) to illustrate these facts by a series of quotations ranging from the first known occurrence of the word to the latest, or down to the present day ; the word being thus made to exhibit its own history and meaning. . . . ."

There are two ways open by which this aim can be reached : the one lies through the unlimited field of literature, the other is to be found in lexicographic works of the last three centuries. The editors of the Dictionary have expended a vast amount of labor and used all

---

3 The oldest inscription I know with the new sign for *o* is that on the Lancaster cross (Stephens ii, 375; iii, 184), which presents a form (⋓) very similar to the ligature conjectured by me above. Another very old inscripton, that on the Whitby comb (Stephens iii, 180), has ⊮ .

reasonable efforts to obtain complete and accurate results from the collaboration of hundreds of literary readers. But not the same care has been bestowed by them on the perusal of old dictionaries and phrase books, and the treatment of a large class of words betrays an oversight of early English lexicography. It almost seems as though the editors had courted a negligent eclecticism and wilful disregard of method.

Among the old dictionaries very frequently quoted by Murray are Huloet, Cockeram, Blount, Phillips, Coles. A few words in regard to each of them are necessary, before the confusion in the Dictionary can be pointed out.

Huloet's *Abecedarium anglico-latinum* appeared in 1552, and marks the beginning of English lexicography. There had, indeed, been printed wordbooks before, but their arrangement and general treatment are such as not to deserve our further consideration. In 1572 an improved edition of it appeared under the title : *Hvloets Dictionarie, newelye corrected, amended, set in order and enlarged, with many names of Men, Townes, Beastes, Foules, Fishes, Trees, Shrubbes, Herbes, Fruites, Places, Instrumentes etc. And in eche place fit Phrases, gathered out of the best Latin Authors. Also the French therevnto annexed, by which you may finde the Latin or Frenche, of anye Englishe woorde you will. By John Higgins late student in Oxeforde.*

It is a vast improvement on Huloet, having been carried out with greater exactness. Wherein the improvement consists we readily glean from the address to the reader :

" At first I toke this worke of Maister Huloets in hande (gentle Reader) onelye to enlarge, and when I had herein passed some paineful time, I perceyued it almost a more easye matter to make new, then to amende : for there were many such woordes, as eyther serued not for the matter, or were out of vse . . . . such woordes as were not sufficient (by consent of authoritye) I eyther displaced, and put farre better in their roumes, or if they were doubtfull, confirmed by sclender authority, or els serued the place but not so fitlye, I gave them an asteriske. . . . . And for ye better attayning to the knowledge of words, I went not to the cōmon Dictionaries only, but also to the authors themselues, and

vsed therein conference with them which wrote particularly of such things, as ye place requyred . . . . and finallye I wrote not in the whole booke one quyre, without perusinge and conference of many authors."

Huloet's and Higgins's dictionaries are only incidentally valuable as lexicographical material, since both directed their main attention to Latin, while Higgins also attempted to create a French wordbook for English students.

In 1616 Dr. Bullokar published a small dictionary in which English words are explained in English, and thus laid the foundation for English dictionaries. His *Expositor* does not seem to have had much popularity, although an enlarged edition of it appeared as late as 1719. Seven years later appeared Cockeram's dictionary which bears the following title : *The English Dictionarie : or an Interpreter of hard English words. Enabling as well Ladies and Gentlewomen, young Schollers, Clarkes, Merchants, as also Strangers of any Nation, to the vnderstanding of the more difficult Authors already printed in our Language, and the more speedy attaining of an elegant perfection of the English tongue, both in reading, speaking and writing. Being a collection of some thousands of words, neuer published by any heretofore. By H. C. Gent. London, 1623.* It consists of two parts. The first " hath the choicest words themselues now in vse, wherewith our language is inriched and become so copious, to which words the common sense is annexed." The second

" containes the vulgar words, which whensoeuer any desirous of a more curious explanation by a more refined and elegant speech shall looke into, he shall there receiue the exact and ample word to expresse the same."

Cockeram's dictionary thus becomes a valuable source of information in regard to words that were commonly used, and those that were affected by the learned. In addition to these categories, he claims to give the "mocke words which are ridiculously vsed in our language " and the " fustian termes, vsed by too many who study rather to bee heard speake, than to vnderstand themselues." Among the several poems addressed to Cockeram in the introduction there are three by the dramatists Ford, Day and Webster, all of

whom praise highly his performance. Day says of him: "Of a rough speech th'ast taught vs all to speake a perfect language," while Ford acknowledges his indebtedness to Cockeram's dictionary and claims that it has gained for the latter a fame "by paths of Art, vntrod before." This important work, which had drawn its information from the best of sources and in turn had served the leading dramatists of his time for a guide, was reprinted in an improved form in 1626 and reached a twelfth edition in 1670.

Blount's *Glossographia* appeared in 1656. As its title indicates, it is "interpreting all such hard words of whatsoever language, now used in our refined English tongue," and was intended to be "very useful for all such as desire to understand what they read." From his sober, unaffected introduction to the reader, we learn that he had collected material for more than twenty years, ransacking books of all descriptions and collecting words used by the different trades.

"Nay, to that pass we are now arrived, that in London many of the Tradesmen have new Dialects; the Cook asks you what Dishes you will have in your Bill of Fare; whether *Olla's, Bisques, Hachies, Omelets, Bouillon's, Grilliades, Joncades, Fricasses;* with a *Houtgoust, Ragovst,* etc. . . . . . The Shoo-maker will make you Boots, *Whole-Chase, Demi-Chase,* or *Bottines,*[1] etc."

He gives only such law terms as he "thought necessary for every gentleman of Estate to understand;" he proceeds in the same way with words referring to the sciences and arts, being careful not to give more than is absolutely necessary. He avoids

"Poetical Stories, as much as I could, since they are not necessary to be understood by the generality. . . . . I have likewise in a great measure, shun'd the old Saxon words; as finding them growing every day more obsolete then other. . . . Yet even such of those, as I found still in use, are not here omitted."

1 Under *bottine* Murray gives: "Adopted in Sc. in 16c., and independently in Eng. in 19th." This is a strange statement in the face of Blount's remark. In the dictionary Blount gives: "*botine* (Fr.), a Buskin or Summer Boot; we otherwise call them Boots with quarters, which have strings and no Spurs, but a heel like a shoo on the out-side." Stranger yet! The word runs through Phillips and Coles. *Demi-Chase* is not at all given in Murray.

So careful is Blount in the selection of his vocabulary that he would not risk recommending neologisms by introducing them in his dictionary: "to many of which I have added the authors' names, that I might not be thought to be the Innovator of them." While perusing the lexicographic works of his predecessors, he has

"taken nothing upon trust, which is not authentick; yet should not I thus adventure to make it publick, but that it also had the perusal and approbation of some very Learned, and my Noble Friends."

This remarkable book which "is chiefly intended for the more-knowing Women, and less-learned Men" appeared in a second edition "more correct; wherein above five hundred choice words are added" in 1661; other editions followed it in quick succession, that of 1681 being the fifth.

Two years after the first appearance of Blount's *Glossographia*, Phillips published his *New World of Words* which contains a much larger vocabulary than the work of any of his predecessors. His dictionary, however, lacks originality being the result of a series of ill digested plagiarisms. Later on he surreptitously copied Blount's *Dictionary of Law-terms,* and his Latin dictionary rests entirely upon John Milton's *Thesaurus.* In 1673 Blount scourged him in his *A World of Errors in a World of Words,* and in the introduction to Coles' dictionary a few of his most glaring mistakes are shown up, such as his identifying *contemptible* with *contemptuous, ingenious* with *ingenuous* and a "thousand more such, which simple Children would be apt to contradict, but Men of Judgement (for whom they were not writ) know where the mistake might lie." In 1778, that is two years after Coles' /1678 first edition, there appeared a much enlarged fourth edition of *A New World of Words,* but the mistakes are not eradicated; there were many more editions of this dictionary, but they do not interest us here.

In 1776 appeared *An English Dictionary* /1676 *explaining the difficult Terms that are used in Divinity, Husbandry, Physick, Phylosophy, Law, Navigation, Mathematicks, and other Arts and Sciences. Containing many thousands of Hard Words (and proper names of*

Places) *more than are in any other English Dictionary or Expositor . . . . by E. Coles, School-Master and Teacher of the Tongue to Foreigners.* It is a careful digest of "the whole succession from Dr. Bulloker to Dr. Skinner, from the smallest volume to the largest folio," and contains a great deal of additional matter, the number of words "being raised from seven in th' Expositor (Bullokar's dictionary) to almost thirty thousand here." An unaltered second edition was published in 1677, others following in rapid succession. Coles published in the same year an English-Latin Dictionary, the English vocabulary of which is entirely drawn from his English Dictionary; it enjoyed great popularity and reached an eighteenth edition in 1772.

It is the chief duty of an historical dictionary to quote first editions of lexicographic works, and in the case of words found in later editions, to give the first of a series of editions containing such words. Thus only do we get a more approximate date for the first use of words that cannot otherwise be ascertained. This principle has been grossly violated by Murray. Cockeram's edition of 1626 is generally quoted, although some words, like *alopicke, alueated, alutation, excelcity* are quoted from the first edition, while others, like *essuriate, excreate, exdecimate* give both 1623 and 1626; none of the later editions are mentioned.[2]

Blount is quoted in his first 1656 edition; a number of words are mentioned under 1681, such as *coangustation, collectititious, apornel,* while in a few cases, such as *crabbat, curvous, dapocaginous, denticle,* the date 1674 (4th edition) is given. In other cases we find the compound 1656–1681 which evidently means only these two dates, for nowhere do we come across the important 1661 edition[3] in which all these words are to be found. Phillips and Coles are generally quoted in much later editions than the first occurrence of the words.

Much more serious are the omissions of

first quotations from these easily accessible sources. In Huloet (1572) the following words occur that are marked in Murray as of a later date: *alecost* (1589), *adourne* (—a banquette, *accoustrer vn banquet;—shippes, naves expedire,* 1589), *blowbottle* (1580), *bodkyn* (1580, Baret copied the explanation of the last two words from Huloet), *clacke* (rattell that children vse to play withall. *Claquette,* 1611), *endamagement* (1593), *exulceratorie* (1727), *exulcerated*[4] (1576), *fabulosity* (1599).

In Cockeram (1623) the following are found: *abequitate* (1627), *ablepsie* (1652), *compaginate* (1648), *efflagitate* (1641), *emarginate* (1656), *equilibrity* (1644), *ereption* (1633), *evitation* (1626), *exacuate* (1632), *extruction* (1652).

Much larger is the number of words that are mentioned as of a later date than 1661, although they are to be found in Blount's second edition: *abnodate* (1721), *absentaneous* (1721), *actitation* (1742), *adagial* (1677), *adonique* (1678), *amict* (in the sense of 'amice,' 1753), *anteact* (1721), *apepsie* (1678), *apian* (1862), *apollinean* (1663), *atrabilarie* (1672[5]), *aulic* (1701), *aurist* (1678), *autarchy* (1691), *belage* (1678), *bovicide* (1678), *bourgeoisie* (1707), *caret* (1710), *cervine* (1832), *cessor* (a loyterer, 1727), *charientione* (1709), *circensial* (1682), *cronie* (1665), *cucurbite* (a gourd, 1866), *curvous* (1674), *dapocaginous* (1674), *denary* (of or containing ten, 1848), *dendrology* (1708), *effluent* (1726), *electorat* (1675), *electrine* (1677), *elenctic* (1833), *embeuchement* (1844), *emendals* (1692), *engyscope* (1684), *epithalamize* (1802), *epulary* (1678), *epulosity* (1731), *epulous* (1692), *Erastianism* (1681), *eriferous* (1681), *eristics* (1866), *erumnate* (1692).

The following are a few of the words given in Coles 1677 (identical with 1676) edition: *adent*[6] (1708), *advowee* (1691), *Agonizant* (1721), *altimetrical* (1681), *ampelite*[6] (1751), *anauntrins* (1691), *astrobolism* (1721), *balneatory* (1731), *bedrawled* (1721), *betty* (1700), *biga* (1850), *bluffer* (1721), *brasset*[6] (1751), *cameral* (1762), *coangustation* (1681), *coker* (1690), *colibert* (1708), *collectitious* (1681), *combinational* (1681), *comperendination* (1678), *compromisorial* (1681),

---

2 Under *ablecticke, abligurie, ablocate, abrodietical* and many other words we find Cockeram 1612! what does that mean?

3 Only once, under *crisom calf* we find Blount 1661, but unfortunately the word is not in Blount 1661.

4 Also given in Huloet 1552.

5 Here and under *attiguous bac* Murray quotes Coles 1672; there is no such edition!

contemeration[6] (1692), *cremaster* (1678), *cucullated*[6] (1737).

Where such negligence is shown in noting dates of first occurrences, it is but natural to find missing many important words. In the following lists hundreds of words, against which any other than an *Historical Dictionary* could raise even a shadow of an objection, are omitted purposely ; for example, Murray does not give *Anakim*, although it is to be found in all of the old, and some of the new, dictionaries. This, which in the phrase of Tennyson's "I felt the thews of Annakim," is a good literary word, has been no doubt ostracized by Murray on the ground that it partakes of the nature of a proper noun. Furthermore, that no suspicion of captious criticism may fall on the writer of this article, the words in Huloet and Cockeram are given with their original explanations, while in a few cases etymological and other notes are added in order to forestall any accusation of arbitrariness in those old lexicographers. In giving etymologies and the semasiology of words, recourse ought to be generally taken to lexicographies of contemporaries, however faulty they may be, as their very faulty ideas about Latin or French words may frequently explain the origin of meanings in their English form. This rule has not been adhered to by the *Historical Dictionary*.

The following words, though given in Huloet's 1572 edition, are not to be found in Murray :

ABHOMINED.[7] Fastiditus. Abhomine, deteste. First quot. in Murray under *abomine* is 1683.

ABSOYLER, any thing that deliuereth a man, the remedy. Absolutorium. Remede qui deliure, deliurance.

ADUAUNCED[7] in stomake as properly to have a proud stomake. Elatus, Hault.

ADUAUNCING and hautenes. Fastus . . . Elatio . . . . Haultenete.

AFFECTUOUSSE[7] . . . Voluptabilis . . . Plaisant. Adonne a ses plaisirs mondains.

AMBULATORIE,[7] or ouermoste parte of a wall, within the battlementes where men may

walke. Procestrium. Du Cange gives under *ambulatorium* : "Est etiam pedatura murorum, seu moenium περίπατος . . . nostris *Rempart.*" Earliest quot. in Murray is 1623, nor is this specific meaning given.

AMPULLY, largely, nobly, with great magnificence. Probably only another spelling for *amply*, but compare *ampullous*, proud, in Florio (1598) and in Du Cange, where *superbus*, Prov. *ergulhos* is given for it.

BEDLEM BODY.[7] Lymphaticus. Furieux, hors du sens.

BEES MEATE,[7] or huny sucle. Cerinthe. Herbe nomme Paquette.

CARME,[7] a tree which the Frenchmen call Carpie. Carpinus. Vne sorte d'arbre Carmie ou charme. Boyer translates *charme* by ' yoke elm.'

CHAUMFERY, or a rabbat. Stria. Chaufrein creux.

CHAUMFREY, or to make foorowes all a longe on a pyller of stone, to wrynkle.

CREPPLE ROUFFE.[7] Interpensiua. Holyoke gives for *interpersiva* : "Certain pieces of timber, cloven boards or stones, which are set in from the corners of the wall, to conveigh rain water in spouts." Cf. *criplings* in Phillips : "short spars on the side of a house," and Boyer gives for this : "solives, pieux." Neither *crepple rouffe* nor *cripling* is in Murray.

CYME.[7] Cement, or cyme, wherewith stones be ioyned together in a lumpe. Du Cange gives under *cimentum* : "Chime, pro Ciment, Arenatum, in Charta Petri etc. . . ."

ENDAMAGEABLE (misprint *endamagable*), or hurtefull, Damnosus, Detrimentosus . . . Dommageable. Murray gives the earliest quot. from Webster 1864 with the meaning of 'capable of receiving damage; perishable.' Also found in Holyoke.

EUESING,[7] or eues setting or trimming. Subgrundatio. This meaning is not given in Murray.

FANTASIED,[7] or fantasyinge, or hauing mynde to a thing. Animatus. The nearest

---

[6] Found even earlier in Phillip's first edition 1658; a few others are found in later editions, though preceding Coles, but I have not marked them down.

[7] Also given in Huloet 1552.

approach to this meaning in Murray is a quot. from 1883, explained as 'whimsical.'

The number of words omitted from Cockeram's 1623 edition is alarmingly large:

ABACTED. Caried away by violence. Given in Blount (who adds: 'or stealth; also deposited,') Coles, Holyoke and Littleton, none of whom mark it obsolete. It is incomprehensible why this should be omitted in Murray, when *abaction* and *abactor* are mentioned.

ADOLESCENTURATE To play the boy, or foole. Cf. Du Cange *adolescentiari*, νεανίζειν . . . adolescentum more agere.

ADRUMINGE. Churlish. Adraming in Phillips ('old word') and Cole (obs.). Probably a participle of the OF. verb *aramir*, *arramir*. In Godefroy the meanings: fort, violent, redoutable; rude, sauvage, are given for *arami*, and Du Cange gives copious quotations for *adramire*.

AENEATOR. A trumpeter. Given in Cole. It has the same meaning in Latin (Suetonius).

AMALTHEAN HORNE. Plenty of all things. In Blount (with a full explanation of the origin of the word), Phillips, Cole.

AMATRIX. A shee-paramour. If *advocatrix*, *executrix* are given in Murray, why not *amatrix?*

AMONISCORNE. A gemme of a gold colour like a Rams horne, which causeth one to dreame true things. It is evidently one with the Ammon's horn.

AMIT. To send away. Cole: to lose, to pardon.

ANTILOGOMENES. Contradictions.

ASSEDILIE. A bishops pue. Cf. Du Cange: *assidua*, pars interior ædis sacræ ubi altare collocatum est, and *absida*, interdum pro Episcopali sede, quod in medio Absidæ collocari soleret.

ATRICKE. An Vsher of a Hall. Given in Phillips and Cole. Formed from Lat. *atrium*, but cf. Godefroy *aitre*, *atre*, etc., portique, porche.

BLEPHARON (misp. *blephoron*) one having great browes and eye lids. In Blount, Phillips, Cole.

BOCCONIE. Payson or Italian figs. Blount gives: *boccone* (Ital.), a morsel, a good bit; sometimes taken for poison. Also in Phillips and Cole. So, too, Petròcchi gives for *boccone* pillola velenosa, in addition to the usual meaning.

CAELEB. A batchellor.

CANNITICKE HOUSES: Thetched houses.

CASTALIDES. The surname of the Muses.

CERICEAN. A subtle knaue. Evidently misspelled for *ceracean* and of the same origin as *ceratine* (argument of the horns).

CIMBICKE. A misard, or niggard. In Phillips and Cole. Du Canges gives: *cimbices*, minima quæque plurimi facientes, apud Sussannæum in Vocabulario, a Græco χίμβηξ, sordidus, tenax et plus æquo parcus.

CLYNOPALY. Ouermuch lechery. In Blount and Cole. Lat. *clinopale* from Greek χλινοπάλη.

CREDITOR-CRAZD. Banquerout.

CYRNE. A goblet to drinke wine in. From Lat. *cirnea*, if not related to Eng. *churn*.

DARDANAR. A forstaller. Du Cange gives: *Dardanarii*, Seplasiarii, Pantoplæ, etc., from which the English meaning is easily developed.

DEDOCEAT. To teach or instruct.

DEFOMICATE. To chip bread, or so. Du Cange gives: *Defomare*, circum secare, dolare, etc.

EBRIOLATE. To make drunke. Littleton gives a Lat. verb *ebriolare*, and an adj. *ebriolatus*.

ECASTOR. By my fay. Murray quotes Cockeram's *ecasterly* but not *ecastor*.

ECCLESIASTICUS. Of, or belonging to a preacher. It is not likely that we have here some misprint, since the word is preceded by *Ecclesiasticke*, a preacher, and *ecclesiasticall*, of or belonging to the Church.

EDECIMATE. To chuse out the tenth man. Murray has *edecimation*, but not *edecimate*.

EDOCTRINATION. A teaching. Murray has *edoctrinate*, but not *edoctrination*.

EDORMIATE. To sleep out ones fill.

EDURATE. To harden.

EMDELUGED. Drowned.

EMULCT. Milked.

ENDROMITE. An Irish(?) mantle, or some winter garment. Blount, Phillips and Cole have *endromick* with the same meaning; Blount, however, does not say 'Irish.' Cf. *endroma, endromes* in Du Cange.

EPHEBEAN. One marriageable at fifteene years. Murray gives the earliest quot. for *ephebe* from 1697, whereas Blount, Phillips and Cole give: *ephiby* a stripling.

EPICARPEAN. A fruit keeper.

EPIGAMIE. An affinitie by Marriage. In Blount and Cole.

EPIOEDEAN SONG. A song sung, ere the corps bee buried.

EQUESTER. A place where men may sit to see plays. Littleton: *equestria*, places or seats in the theatre for the gentry to sit in and see shows and plays.

EQUIMENT. Wages for horse-hire. Littleton: *equimentum*, the hire of a stallion horse, for coueoring or leaping a mare.

ERATED. Coured with brasse.

ERGASTER. A workhoure.

ERGASTULE. A gayle.

ERRUGE. Rust. In Murray *ærugo* with the first date 1753 is given.

EUGENIE. Nobleness. In Blount (nobleness or goodness of birth or blood), Phillips, Cole.

EURYBATIZISE. To steale things in a house.

EXAGOGE. Reuenue.

EXANIATE. To squeeze.

EXAREANATE. To wash off grauell, or sand.

EXCANDENCIE (misprint *excadencie*). Anger which both suddenly cometh and goeth.

EXCALPE. To ingraue.

EXCOLETE. 'Decked.

EXCORE. To flea, or skinne.

EXDORSICATE. To breake the Backe bone.

EXOCULATE. To put out one's eye.

From Blount's second edition (the first is at this moment not accessible to me) a very large number of words is wanting; this is especially to be regretted when we consider the extreme care with which Blount collected his words:

Absolonism, accomodatitious, accort,[8] acupictor,[8] addomestique, adecatist, almadarats, alosha[8] ambiloge, Amphionize, anity, an-

thime, Antigonize, antiprestiglation, Apellean, appensor, arbustine, arseverse, Artemisean,[8] asotus,[8] astism,[8] astroarch (not in Phillips or Coles), attraits,[8] bilinguis,[8] bovillon,[8] brian,[8] bruma, bruyere, campsor, cathedrarious, catholisation, cenatical, cenosity, cepphic (not in Phillips or Coles), ceromatick,[8] certaminate, cesariated, ceterious, cindalism, circiture, cir cumstantibus, circunvagant, Cretan, Cretical (the last two not in Phillips or Coles), crinigerous, curricurro,[8] cynorexie,[8] dabuze,[8] dearch, demichace, demonachation[8] edisserator, egilopical, elacerate, embossement,[8] emention, enargy, encheson,[8] enthalamize, entheated, enthysiasmical, epigrammatographer, epiod, epithemetical, epostracism, equidial, equorean,[8] escambio,[8] esopical, estiferous, exercitate (verb, not in Phillips or Coles), exharmonians (not in Phillips or Coles), exuge, falcator, falouque.[8]

The following are a few that are given in Coles but not in Murray:

Abderian, abent,[9] abettator, abintestate,[9] Abram-Cove, abric, acaid, accodrinc, acephalic,[9] acerate (full of chaffe), adarige, adashed,[9] ægroting, affidatus, Agathonian,[9] ale-silver, amblothridium,[9] anabrochism, anacrisis, andena, andrago,[9] andromant, antiaxiomatism,[9] antipagments[9] antipast,[9] antistœchon, aqua cœlestis,[9] arborancy, ballmoney, bambalio,[9] barfee,[9] barcaria, baude,[9] beau-pleading,[9] bedelan, belchier,[9] bener, besca, bigge (pap or teat) blakes, blower (quean), boa[9] (swine pox), bostock, bostal, borametsy, boscaria, bosinnus, boveria, brevan, busca, cabanne, chologogon, chronodix,[9] chrysites, circumfulgent, clermatine, cœnotes, colus,[9] compar, comparats, concratitious, conditor (a seasoner), configulation,[9] consputation,[9] corporeature,[9] cosmodelyte, cruental, cullot.[9]

It is a disappointment to find that in Murray a majority of technical terms referring to horsemanship and war have been quoted at second hand from Bailey and Chambers, the latter of whom quotes verbatim et literatim from *The Gentleman's Dictionary*, while the first makes ill disguised literal changes. This classical work has served as the basis of some

[8] Also given in Coles 1677.

[9] Found earlier in Phillips first edition (1658).

military dictionaries even in our century; its title runs as follows: *The Gentleman's Dictionary in three parts. I, The Art of Riding the great Horse, etc. . . . II, The Military Art, etc. . . . III, The Art of Navigation, etc. . . . Each part done alphabetically from the sixteenth edition of the original French, published by the Sieur Guillet, and dedicated to the Dauphin. With large additions, alterations and improvements, adapted to the customs and actions of the English, and above forty curious cuts, that were not in the original. London 1705.*

From the Publisher's Preface we see that the English terms given in the dictionary are thoroughly reliable and not mere imitations of French words: "In translating this part (the first), we have taken care to do justice to the French, and at the same time to bring it as near to our Jockey Terms, as the nature of the thing would allow." In the following list are not included such words as are purely French in form, although some of them no doubt might have been given:

abate (1721), action,[10] advance fosse,[10] aftward (1867), air,[10] alarm post (1721), anspesade (1751), antestature (1706), apron (1719), appointe (1727), arm (1751), armed,[10] arzel,[10] assembly (1727), aubin (1751), bacule,[10] balotade (1727), bandeleer,[10] banquet (1753), bar (1753), barbe,[10] barepump,[10] barm (1729), barque-longue,[10] battery master,[10] bean,[10] beat (1753), biovac (1706), bleyne,[10] blossom,[10] bear (1731), bouillon,[10] bout,[10] boyau (1847), branch (1838), brassicourt,[10] braye,[10] breast,[10] breastplate (1720), breed,[10] bridge,[10] brigade major (1810), brillant (1731), bring in (1753), cadence (Bailey), calade (1731), capesquare,[10] capital (1706), carry low,[10] carry well (1829), cavin (1708), chack (1731), chaufrin (1730), channel (1753), chapelet (1753), chaperon,[10] chevaler (1753), chevrette (1731), clamponnier (1731), claye (1708), clift,[10] close,[10] coffer (1727), coffin bone (1720), complement (1708), conductor (1778), cork,[10] cornet (incorrectly treated); couched,[10] countermarked (1727), counterpoise (1727), crack,[10] creat (1730), cric (1874?), croat,[10] cross,[10] crowned,[10] croupade (1849), curb (a tumour),[10] deceive,[10] demigorge (1706), ebrillade (1753), ecavessade,[10] echarpe (1772), effect,[10] embrace,[10] empatement,[10] enciente (1708), encraine (1731),

enfilade (1706), enlarge (1753), entrepas,[10] envelope (1707), ergot (Syd. Soc. Lex.), estrapade (1730), extend,[10] face of a place (1727), face of a gun (1727), falcade (1730), fanion (1706).

It is to be sorely regretted that the *Oxford Dictionary* does not incorporate the results of a thorough study of the old dictionaries, cyclopedias and word books.

<div align="right">LEO WIENER.</div>

Cambridge, Mass.

FINAL -s IN GERMANIC.

THE theory, revived by Hirt, PBB., xviii, 527ff., that in West Germ. final -*s* as well as -*z* fell away, seems to be gaining ground. This view is favorably received by Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.*, §214. This I consider unproved and improbable.

The state of the case, as it seems to me, is this: Final -*s* very often became -*z* by analogy, but never through phonetic change. A -*z* thus arising disappeared in W. G. the same as an original Germ. -*z*.

We know that in *o*-stems in Germ. the nom. sing. should, according to accent, end in -*az* or -*as*. As a matter of fact we have no evidence that the nom. sing. ever ended in -*as*. In O.N. the ending is uniformly -*r* or its equivalent, and that, too, where we know the final -*s* was preceded by an accent, as in the preterit participle. Even *iā*-stems in O.N. assumed *r* in the nom. sing., as *heiðr*. That the same generalization took place in all the W.G. dialects cannot be affirmed positively—unless it is proved that final -*s* remained—but it is highly probable. It is at least more reasonable to assume such a generalization than to set up a separate phonetic law to account for the disappearance of final -*s*.

In the nom. plur. there was a singular generalization in O.N. In the W. G. dialects there is variation. This variation is more easily explained by supposing that final -*s* remains, while final -*z* falls away, than to assume that final -*s* also fell away. O.H.G. *tagā*, then, corresponds to O.N. *dagar*, Goth. *dagós*, as all agree; while O.S. *dagos*, O.E. *dagas* may well represent a Germ. ending -*ōs*, with-

10 Not given in Murray.

out resorting to a comparison with the Skt. *dēvāsas*. And why not regard the O.Frs. ending *-ar* as in *fiskar*, *būrar* as transferred from the neuter *es*-stems? This indeed is the explanation of Siebs, *Paul's Grundriss*, i, p. 762, though he confines it to the dialect of Wangeroog.

The question naturally arises: Why did not a nom. plur. fem. ending *-ōs* develop in the same way? Why not O.S. **gebos?* For as Hirt, PBB., xviii, 525, thinks, there were more *ā*- than *o*- stems with accented ultima. This is not a matter to be decided by counting. The form that gains the ascendancy in a dialect does not necessarily represent the majority. If it did, we should be forced to many strange conclusions. On the supposition that O. Frs. *fiskar* shows an ending *-ōses*, O.S. *dagos* an ending *-ōses*, and O.H.G. *tagā* the ending *-ōz* or *-ōs*, we should be driven to an absurdity by a majority rule. For reasons not always easily accounted for, each dialect went its own way and made its own choice. A form like O.H.G. *zwô*, therefore, does not prove that an *-s* has fallen away, since we may suppose that an original *twôs* first became by analogy **twôz*, and then *zwô*. Otherwise, what shall we say about O.N. *tuér*, *þrír?* Here if anywhere, as Hirt, PBB., xviii, 527, remarks of Goth. *twôs*, O.H.G. *zwô*, the *s* should have remained surd. But it did not in O.N. More than that, the *r* was added to forms where it did not belong originally, as *tueir*, *þeir*, Goth. *twai*, *þai*.

From Goth. *þanzei*, *hwanzuh* we should infer that in *o*-stems the acc. plur. ended in *-anz* and not *-ans*. There is evidence for this also in the other dialects. Many see in O.H.G. acc. plur. *taga*, O.S. *daga* the representative of Goth. *dagans*, on the supposition that in N. and W.G. final *-ns* (*-nz*) fell away. So Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.*, p. 231. This accounts for forms that otherwise cause difficulty. But it is easier to assume the disappearance of final *-nz* than of *-ns*. For if *-ns* disappeared, it leaves such forms as *uns*, *gans* to be explained. If, however, final *-nz* fell of, it must have been at an early period—at least before the syncope of *i* or *a* in the third syllable. For while, according to this theory, Goth. *dagans* is the same as O.H.G. *taga*;

Goth. *hanins<*haniniz*, *gripans<*gripanaz* are in O.H.G. *hanen*, *grifan*. From O.N. *hana* but *gripenn* it would seem that syncope took place earlier in **hananiz* than in **gripanaz*, unless with Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.*, p. 255, footnote, we suppose that in the latter word the nom. sing. has been re-formed from the oblique cases.

In whatever way taken the theory of the disappearance of final *-nz* has its difficulties. I therefore propose this formulation of it : (1) In N. and G.W. final *-z* when preceded by *n* fell off. This occurred at an early period, but later than the change of the acc. sing. **dagam* to **dagan*. The acc. plur. **daganz>*dagan*, we may suppose, about the time that the acc. sing. had reached the stage **daga*. Later the acc. plur. **dagan*, **sunun*, etc., became O.N. *daga*, *sunu*, O.H.G. *taga*, **sunu* (cf. *situ*), O.E. *sunu*. (2) After this change had taken place, final *-z* again came in contact with *n* in the gen. sing of *n*-stems, when **hananiz*, **haniniz>* **hanan*, **hanin*. This stage is seen in Runic *þrawngan* and in the Finnish loanword *maanantai*. As final *-n* in O.N. disappears, the gen. sing. became *hana*. In W.G. the final *-n* of the gen. sing. *hanan*, *hanen* remained. In this second period, therefore, the *-n* in W.G. was protected until after the first period, when the *-n* was subject to decay. (3) Unless we explain the pret. part. with Streitberg as above, we must set up a third period for O.N. on account of Runic *haitinaR>*O.N. *heitenn*. But if these forms are to be judged as *steinn< stainaR*, *skinn<*skinaR*, then the syncope occurred at a time when *R<z* was assimilable to *n*.

In the other stems the ending of the gen. sing. makes less noticeable the difference in the nom. plur., where O.S. *dagos*, O.E. *dagas* appear strange by the side of the plur. fem. *geba*, *giefa*. Now 've find that the ending of the gen. sing. in N. and W.G. is *-s* in *o*-stems and in nouns modeled thereafter, but in *ā*-stems and, for the most part, in other stems it is *-r* in O.N., with the corresponding ending in W.G. So the surprise at the difference in the development of the nom. plur. of *o*- and *ā*-stems in O.S. and O.E. need not be so great when we see there is a corresponding difference in the gen. sing. It may be that more

ā- than *o*-stems had an accented ultima; but the invariable *-r* in the gen. sing. of O.N. *ā*-stems together with the constant *-s* of *o*-stems does not point that way. And since N. and W.G. agree so well in the gen. ending, we may conclude that G.W. had **dages* but **gebōz* corresponding to O.N. *dags* and *giafar.*

The ending of the second sing. of the verb was either *-z* or *-s* in Germ. It would properly be *-z* in the pres. ind. and opt. of thematic verbs of the normal type, and *-s* in aorist-presents, in weak verbs, in many athematic verbs, and in the pret. opt. The several dialects have generalized in different ways, or have made use of both endings. In Goth. there is positive evidence only for *-z.* In O.N. *-r* became the normal ending in all verbs, though *-s* is found in some earlier forms. In W.G. there was originally *-s* and *-z*, but, of course, not distributed in the way they are found in the monuments. It is quite probable that the *-s* of the second sing. in W.G. spread from a comparatively few forms where it remained after most of the verbs had generalized *-z.* This would naturally happen when *-z* fell away, for then there would remain no second sing. ending but *-s.* In this restoration the *-s* attached itself first to the pres. ind. of those verbs that had not retained it. Next it went to the pres. opt., though not in all dialects. The pret. opt. naturally followed. In O.E. the *-s* was confined to the pres. ind. of strong verbs and the pres. and pret. ind. of weak verbs. In the other W.G. dialects the *-s* occurs in all second sing. forms except the pret. ind. of strong verbs. Here it was not necessary to add the *-s* to distinguish the second sing. from the other forms. Now the fact that O.H.G. has *-t* in the third sing. is of no weight in judging of this matter: for generalizations are not always consistent. So while the *-ð* of O.S. *bindið*, O.E. *bindeð* and of O.S., O.E. *bindað* is evidence for the originality of the *-s* of O.S. *bindis*, O.E. *bindes;* the *-t* of O.H.G. *bintit* is not evidence that the *-s* in *bintis* is not original. That is, the *-s* of the second sing. in W.G. arose from *-ĕsi* just as certainly as the *-ð* of the third sing. in O.S. and O.E. started from verbs accented *-ĕti.*

Moreover this *-s* cannot be regarded as an assimilation from *-z* due to the appended pronoun *þu*, as some, following Paul, PBB. vi, 549, suppose. For if Germ. *z-þ*>O.H.G. *s-t*, certainly *zd* would yield *st*, since *d*>*t.* This is what actually took place in passing from I.E. to Germ. Here may be mentioned Goth. *asts*, O.H.G. *geist, gersta, mast, nest*, in which *st* comes from I.E. *zd.* But Goth., Germ. *zd* always gives O.H.G. *rt*, O.E. *rd.* So Goth. *razda*, O.H.G. *rarta*, O.E. *reord;* O.H.G. *brort*, O.E. *brord*, with which is to be compared O.Ch. Slav. *brazda;* Goth. *mizdō*, O.E. *meord.*[1] Germ. *zd* developed thus in O.H.G. because *z* became *r* long before *d* became *t.* If then the pronoun *þu* had been joined often enough to the verb to cause the final *-z* to be treated as medial, it would have given rise in W.G. to a second sing. ending in *-r*, the *-r* remaining as in *er, wir, ur-*, etc. And those holding the assimilation *-z-þu*>*-s-t* can not go back to the I.E. *-s-tu;* for certainly the contact was no closer here than in compounds of *ur,-* and besides, as the derivation of *thousand*<**tūs- kn̥tio-*[2] shows, I. E. *s*+tenuis, when brought together in a compound, were not protected from change as in a simple word.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Chicago.

THE HISTORY OF A VULGARISM.

THERE survives in America as a vulgarism a sound which two centuries ago was a common pronunciation. This pronunciation is not confined to any one district as the South or the North, but may be heard anywhere throughout the country, in the mouths of the unlettered. The pronunciation referred to is the vulgar sound of *oi* in such words as *appoint, poison, join, toil, spoil, coil, boil*, etc., where the diphthong is pronounced so as to rime with long *i.* Now, in the seventeenth century this was an accredited pronunciation as we are informed by the orthoepists of that century, and this information is confirmed by an examination of the rimes of the poets of that period among whom the more prominent are

1 Brugmann, *Grundriss* i, §596.

2 Brugmann, ii, 2, §180.

Dryden and Pope. Pope's ear was early caught by the musical cadences of Dryden's vigorous verse which he studied assiduously, and so the pronunciation of the former, though he lived into the fourth decennium of the last century, was practically identical with that of the latter (inasmuch as one's pronunciation is acquired in early boyhood).

An examination into the rimes of Dryden and Pope proves conclusively that they pronounced the sound in question precisely as our rustics and the Irish do. This statement is made advisedly, for the language of the Irish is very closely related to that of our rustics, as any one may see who will reflect for a moment, and they are both not very far removed from the speech of Dryden and Pope. The English that was brought to America by the English settlers is practically the same as that taken to Ireland, for both of these countries were settled by the English about the same time. It is true there were early settlements in Ireland in the twelfth century when the English began to plant colonies in Forth and Bargay, but these never flourished, and so the English tongue never gained any ground on Irish soil. But in the early part of the seventeenth century (1611) James I planted colonies in the northern part of Ireland, in Ulster, and in 1649 Cromwell invaded the country.[1] Then it was that the English language found its way thither and gained a foothold upon Irish soil. Therefore the English tongue was transplanted into America and Ireland about the same time, and this was the speech of Dryden and Pope. Now it is interesting to note that the English taken to America and that taken to Ireland were both emigrated languages, and that the former flourished and grew apace while the latter stood still. Indeed, the English on Irish soil has always seemed an exotic and has made very little development.[2] Of course this remark applies only to the language spoken in the rural districts where the Celtic traditions have never been entirely lost. Here is where we find the brogue most accentuated,

which is really nothing more nor less than the Celtic mode of utterance applied to English sounds. It is this concomitant, inherent in the very nature of the Celtic mode of utterance, which constitutes the Irish brogue. One of the most marked essentials of this brogue, according to Mr. Murray,[3] is the peculiar intonation, "which appears full of violent ups and downs or rather precipices and chasms of force and pitch, almost disguising the sound to English ears."

To return to Dryden and Pope whose pronunciation offers so many parallels to that of the Irish and of the illiterate Americans—a fossilized seventeenth century English—we find *join* riming with *divine*, as in Pope's oft-quoted couplet,

> "Good-nature and good-sense must ever join
> To err is human, to forgive, divine."
> *Essay on Crit.* l. 524.

So in

> "'Tis not enough, taste, judgment, learning, join;
> In all you speak, let truth and candour shine,"
> *Ibid.*, 562.

and in

> "Waller was smooth; but Dryden taught to join
> The varying verse, the full-resounding line,
> The long majestic March and Energy divine."
> *Im. of Hor.*, 267.

Without taking up space by quoting illustrative passages, suffice it to say that these and similar rimes are of frequent occurrence in both Dryden and Pope. Perhaps it should be said that the examination was confined to Dryden's more careful work such as his *Absalom and Achitophel, Annus Mirabilis, Palamon and Arcite, Wife of Bath, Good Parson, Religio Laici*, etc., and did not include his work for the stage in which there are confessedly indications of haste and carelessness. In both Dryden and Pope the result shows the following:

1. *join* regularly riming with *divine, line, dine, sign, shine, design; join'd* with *mind, refin'd; joins* with *mines*, etc. 2. *joy* riming with *lie.* 3. *toil* riming with *smile, pile*, etc. 4. *guile* riming with *spoil*, etc. 5. *coin* riming with *line.* 6. *purloin* riming with *mine*, etc.

---

[1] Cf. *Green's History of the English People*, 457 and 574 seq.

[2] Cf. the article on Irish Pronunciation of English by Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, Vol. iv, pp. 1230 seq.

[3] Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 1232.

Now, there can of course be no question about the genuineness of this sound of *oi*, for, as the results show, the *oi* rimes with the diphthongal sound of long *i*, which, it is a well established fact, had been diphthonged since the fifteenth century. This is, also, confirmed by the orthoepists of that period. *The Expert Orthographist* in 1704 admits that the *oi* in *choice, exploit, froise, noise, poise, quoif, quoit, rejoice, voice, void*, has the sound of the diphthong *ai*, but adds that "in the middle of most other words *oi* sounds *i* long [that is, *əi*], as *anoint, boil, broil, coin, loin, moil, toil, poison, point.*"[4]

It is noteworthy that this *oi*-diphthong occurs almost exclusively in words of Anglo-French origin, the word *boil* in the sense of tumor (which is of Anglo-Saxon origin, *bȳle*) being the sole exception.[5] Its A.-S. form exhibits *ȳ*, and it ought of course to have developed into the now vulgar *bile* if its normal development had not been arrested. But, according to Sweet, in the eighteenth century the analogy of the verb *boil* (<Anglo-French *boillir*) deflected it from its normal course into its present sound, and its orthography became stereotyped as *boil*, perhaps to suit the logic of the eye, to use Lowell's apt phrase. In the *Promptorium Parvulorum* and in Wyclif's translation (Ex. 9. 9.) it is written *bile*, and even in Shakspere[6] this writing may be found. May not an effort to avoid confusion with *bile* (secretion of the liver) have had some influence in facilitating the change?

Perhaps it may not be out of place to give a brief sketch of the development of this sound in English.[7] In the sixteenth century when the orthoepists first give any information regarding this sound, it seems from their indefinite and even conflicting statements that there were recognized at least three sounds of this diphthong; namely, *oi, iu*, and *uui*, of which the first was the most common. For example, in 1621 Gill[8] gave both *soil* and

---

[4] Cf. *Ellis, Early English Pronunciation*, i, p. 135.

[5] Cf. Sweet, *History of English Sounds*, § 854.

[6] Cf. "Biles and plagues plaster you o'er."—*Cor.* i. 4. 31.

[7] My monograph on the *Historical Study of the English ŏ-Vowel* (D. C. Heath & Co.), does not include this diphthong.

[8] Cf. Ellis, *Early Engl. Pron.* i. p. 133.

---

suuil for soil, *boil* and *buuil* for boil, *spoil* and *spuuil* for spoil, *toil* and *tuuil* for toil, *dzhuuint* for joint, *disappuuint* for disappoint, *buui* for buoy, *redzhois* for rejoice, *vois* for voice and *oil* for oil.

About the middle of the seventeenth century there developed a new sound in the case of some words such as boil, toil and oil, and this is the pronunciation of long *i* (*əi*) of that period. In 1653 Wallis[9] says:

"In *oi* . . . vel *oy* . . . præponitur aliquando *ð* apertum (ut in Anglorum *bóy* puer, *tóys* nugæ . . . .), aliquando *ð* obscurum, (ut in Anglorum *bðil* coqueo, *tðil* labor, *ðil* oleum . . . .), quanquam non negem etiam horum nonnulla à quibusdam per *o* apertum pronunciari."

From this we should infer that this new sound (*əi*) did not supplant the old received pronunciation, but simply existed beside it. This new diphthong was composed of an indistinct vowel followed by a vanishing *i*. This is the first information we find anent this peculiar sound of *oi*, which was so common in Dryden and Pope's time and which now survives only as a vulgarism.

Cooper[10] in 1685, though he says that *oi* is generally pronounced as "*o* in *loss, lost*, i præpositus . . . semper Græci, ut πολλοì," still attests this new pronunciation. In speaking of the sound of long *i* of his day he says: "Scribitur per *oi* in *injoin* injungo, *joint* junctura; *jointure* dos, *broil* torreo, *ointment* unguentum." So Jones[11] in 1701, while he gives the usual pronunciation of *oi*, still admits that some give it the sound of long *i*, that is (*əi*), as in *boil, broil, coil, foil, foist, froise, groin, hoise, join, loin, moil, oilet, poise, poison, soil, spoil, tortois*, and adds that long *i* is written *oy* "when it may be sounded *oy* in the end of words, or before a vowel; *Chandois, decoy*, etc.—*loyal, royal, voyage;* sometimes abusively sounded as with an *i* [that is (*əi*)]." The *Expert Orthographist* (cited above) is the last to admit this sound of *oi* as in *poison, point, boil*, etc. But it must have lingered on for some time later as Pope's rimes show conclusively, and as its persis-

---

[9] Cf. Ibid.

[10] Cf. Ellis, *Early Engl. Pron.* i. p. 134.

[11] Cf. Ibid.

tence in vulgar American English and in the Irish dialect indicates.

In the latter part of the eighteenth century, however, this sound must have died out, as no orthographist of that period recognizes it, and the *oi* was fully restored in the words where (*ǝi*) had been used for about a century, though not to the exclusion of the former. Sweet says it was the spelling which "caused the reaction against the pronunciations (bǝil, pǝizǝn), etc."

EDWIN W. Bowen.

Randolph-Macon College.

ANGLO-SAXON GRAMMAR.
Abriss der angelsächsischen Grammatik, von EDUARD SIEVERS. Halle a.S.: Max Nie-meyer, 1895.

THERE has been no lack of new outline grammars of Old English within the past few years. In this country alone three such books have been brought out in two years: in 1893 Hempl's *Old-English Phonology;* in 1894 Cook's *First Book in Old English,* and Bright's *Outline of Anglo-Saxon Grammar;* each containing some new features of its own which have recommended it to the use of students. Sievers' *Abriss der angelsächsischen Grammatik* is another valuable addition to the working library of the student of Old English, and one that claims our close attention, coming, as it does, from the greatest authority on this subject.

Sievers' *Angelsächsische Grammatik,* first published in 1882, is a landmark in the history of Old English grammars. It may be said to introduce a third period, just as Hickes' *Institutiones Grammaticæ Anglo-saxonicæ, et Mœso-gothicæ* (1689) opened the first, and Rask's *Angelsaksisk Sproglære* (1817) the second period. It superannuated the long list of Old English grammars written in this century more or less under the influence of Rask and Grimm; it was the first really trustworthy modern handbook for the study of the language. By adhering to the sound basis of the West-Saxon prose and discriminating between earlier and later forms, Professor Sievers reduced to order the perplexing mass of material recorded in previous grammars, and

thus laid a solid foundation for further fruitful research. His work—to quote Henry Sweet's words—' has indeed lighted up the obscure and tortuous paths of Old English dialectology and linguistic chronology in much the same way as Bopp's grammar lighted up the intricacies of Arian philology.' Sweet himself had pointed the way and done the pioneer work : to Sievers is due the consummation of the labors for bringing Old English grammar up to date. Works published or republished since 1882 in which this great progress had not been sufficiently taken notice of (for example, Theodor Müller's *Angelsächsische Grammatik,* ed. by Hilmer, 1883, and Körner's *Angelsächsische Laut- und Formenlehre,* 2d ed. by Socin, 1887), were in a measure antiquated from the very beginning.

The second edition of Sievers' grammar (1886) received important additions, chiefly from the author's own collections ; and in this form, both in the original German version and in Professor Cook's English translation, it has held its honored place for nearly ten years. In the meantime our knowledge has been variously supplemented in details, and in particular the intelligent, systematic investigation of the different dialects has been carried on energetically by such scholars as Cosijn, Napier, Cook, Brown, Lindelöf, and others. A comprehensive presentation of all the results of recent research (by himself and others) is eagerly awaited from the pen of Professor Sievers. We regret to learn that no term can yet be set for the completion of the third edition of his grammar. But, as a forerunner to it, we welcome gladly the brief *Abriss,* which forms the second number in the series of ' Abrisse ' published parallel with the 'Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte.'

What strikes us first in glancing over this book, is the evidence it gives of the desire for simplification and more practical treatment recognized by this time in the author's country. In England the want of a simple, practical grammar for beginners had been supplied by the grammatical sketch in Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader,* and especially in his admirable *Anglo-Saxon Primer* issued (in 1882) about six years after the first appearance of the

Reader;—for we may leave out of account Earle's *Book for the Beginner in Anglo-Saxon.* It is also noteworthy that the grammatical introduction in the latest (seventh) edition of Sweet's *Reader* (1894) has been recast, obviously with a view to facilitate its use, if not to simplify it. America has recently been well provided with practical handbooks by Hempl, Bright, and Cook. A Dutch scholar has written one in German (Cosijn, *Kurzgefasste altwestsächsische Grammatik,* 2d ed. 1893). Joseph Wright's *Old High-German, Middle High-German,* and *Gothic Primers,* and Sweet's *Icelandic Primer,* published between 1886 and 1892, testify to the same general tendency.

The two avowed objects of Sievers' *Abriss* are to serve as a basis for lectures on Old English grammar and to furnish beginners with the immediately needed grammatical help for the reading of texts. To meet the former of these objects, the comparative point of view has been made particularly prominent, more so than in Sievers' larger 'Grammar.' The author has, indeed, refrained from references to Indo-European relations and has certainly done well in giving up the terms *o-,* and *â- declension* in favor of *a-,* and *ô- declension* respectively. But the relation of Old English to the other Teutonic dialects has been constantly kept in view. In the sections on phonology the representation of the Teutonic sounds in Gothic, Old Saxon and Old High-German has been mentioned. The West Germanic stage of the vowels has been omitted, but that of the consonants has been added (§23),—a decided improvement. As regards the inflections, we find, in addition to the Gothic paradigms of the pronouns and frequent illustrations from the Gothic as well as occasional ones from the High-German, the paradigms of the (much neglected) Old Saxon given throughout parallel with those of the Old English.

Practical considerations seem to have led Sievers to a remarkable change of principle. Though he does not expressly state it, he has practically made the Late West-Saxon the basis in preference to the Early West-Saxon. Thus he gives *y* and *ỷ* as the 'gemeinags.' form of the *i*-umlaut of *ea*, *eo* and *ĕa, ĕo; i,*

y as the 'gemeinags.' equivalent of Early West-Saxon *ie* from *ĕ* after palatals (§8.2, §9.2, §17, §18); and he regulates the use of the symbols *þ* and *ð* so as to employ in initial position *þ*, otherwise *ð* (§37; cf. *Gr.²,* §199). At the same time all the chief peculiarities of the other dialects and of the poetical texts have been carefully pointed out in the notes. Nor has chronology been neglected. Besides mentioning occasionally special features of the oldest texts and characterizing late forms as such, the full paradigm of the oldest forms of the conjugation has been given, together with the standard Old English forms. In a few cases the author's terminology appears a little ambiguous; for example, when he speaks of West-Saxon, Anglian and 'the other dialects' (§88, n. 1.; cf. *Gr.²,* §371, n.), or of 'some Anglian dialects' (§9, n. 4); certainly a brief introductory remark about the dialectal divisions would have been welcome.

The arrangement of the material is deserving of unqualified praise. Part of the credit is no doubt (cf. the Preface) due to Professor Braune, whose 'Abriss' of the Old High-German Grammar has been the model for this work. A uniform plan runs through the book. In the treatment of the vowels and of the consonants first the special rules affecting certain groups of sounds (*i*-umlaut, breaking, contraction, grammatical change, etc.) are set forth, and then the regular development of each sound is traced. The result is a marked simplification and clearness, as may be seen at a glance from the account of *a, e, i, u* (§§8–10). Similarly, in the strong verbs, the deviations from the simple paradigm forms that are caused by phonological peculiarities (for example, expansion by *jo*-suffix, grammatical change, contraction) have been prefixed to the exposition of the ablaut classes,—the best and most concise formulation we know of. The account of the declensions is substantially unchanged, though, of course, greatly abridged and simplified, sometimes by transposition (cf. §45, n. 2—*Gr.²* §§280–290; §50—*Gr.²* §279).

In condensing the material Sievers has been eminently successful. On fifty-six pages and two tables containing the paradigms of the verbs, he has presented all that is essential in

his 'Grammar.' Only in some exceptional instances it would seem that a word of explanation has been left out. We miss a remark about the *phonetic* value of *x*, when used for *hs* (§38, n. 2; §42c; cf. Hempl, *Old-English Phonology*, §§60 ii, 84, 90, 4 n.). That no mention has been made of the relative particle *ðe* (cf. §82), that nothing has been said about the use of the strong and the weak form of the adjective, and almost nothing about the adverb (cf. §§68, n. 3; 71, n. 3; §73), can hardly be charged as a fault against a book which excludes word-formation and syntax. But this brings home to us again the urgent need of an adequate, up-to-date treatment of these important subjects. We have not yet a complete Old English Grammar.

Of additions and changes in detail we may mention the rule of the disappearance of medial *w* after consonants in West Germanic (§26, n. 3); the designation of the rune for *w* as *wyn*, no longer as *wén* (§26, n. 1; cf. *Gr.²*, §171); the form **frignjan* as the prototype of *frignan* (§91, n. 8); the meaning '*einzeln*,' besides '*einzig*,' for the plural of *án*—apparently as an explanation of *ánra gehwylc* (§74). We are surprised to find *mugon* (§104) substituted for *magon* (*Gr.²*, §424); *lẽsan* (*lesen*) (§93, n. 1; *Gr.²*, §391, n. 1: *sammeln*) is ambiguous. Of misprints not mentioned in *Anglia, Beiblatt* vi, 129 ff., or *Englische Studien* xxii, 73 f., we have noticed in §24, n. 1, 1. line: Germ. *w*—*yw* for : Germ. *hw*—*yw* ; in §19, n. 1, 3. line : § 58 for : § 59.

In summing up, we would say that Sievers has solved a difficult problem most satisfactorily. He has not said much that is new, but he has put many things in a new way. We venture to predict an extensive use of the book in Germany; and it seems to us that also in this country it could very profitably be used with advanced classes. Those who work with Sievers' *Grammar*, will make no mistake in securing this *Abriss* besides. It is an excellent work of its kind, similar to Joseph Wright's *Gothic Primer*, and may be especially recommended to those who have worked through the latter book.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.

University of Minnesota.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Eugénie Grandet par Honoré de Balzac. Edited with introduction and notes by EUGENE BERGERON, Assistant Professor in the University of Chicago. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 8vo, pp. xxi, 280. 1895. With portrait.

La Frontière par Jules Claretie. Edited, with an introduction and explanatory notes in English, by CHARLES A. EGGERT, Ph. D., L. L. B., New York: William R. Jenkins, 16 mo., paper, pp. vii, 126. 1895. 25 cents.

Selected Essays from Sainte-Beuve. With introduction, bibliography and notes by JOHN R. EFFINGER, JR., Instructor in French, University of Michigan. Boston: Ginn & Co., 8vo, pp. xii, 118. 1895.

INCREASED attention has been called to Balzac in this country during the past year. Of much interest to English readers—who have not the Balzacian French under control—has been the appearance of a new and presumably superior translation of the novelist, with introductions by George Saintsbury. The edition is from the Macmillan house, is illustrated, and has, at present writing, reached its eighth volume. It has given an opportunity for renewed study of the author's aims and methods, and has allowed "another last word" to be said in criticism of his realism.

Of not less interest to teachers and students of French is the first American edition, in the original, of the masterpiece in fiction that is considered by many to be Balzac's best work. *Eugénie Grandet*, in an edition issued by Hachette et Cie., has been used to some extent in this country, but was, I think, found insufficient and incomplete. A very welcome addition to our material for teaching French literature is the full and well printed edition of Professor Bergeron. It supplies a real need.

The editor's preface of three pages addresses, to the student who is unaquainted with Balzac, some general suggestions upon the quality and nature of his theme. I have recently seen, in a short book-notice, this preface rated as "somewhat perfunctory." I think the criticism unjust; the fact, however, of such remarks being very general, may tend

possibly to render them unduly erudite. The introduction, devoted to the life and works of the author, gives in classified order the titles of the more important novels, followed often by pertinent and appreciative remarks upon their themes. Little or no comment is made upon Balzac as a painter of real life, or as to whether he "is so far from being a realist, in the general acceptation of the word, that even Victor Hugo is less a romancer." The text is preceded by a translation of a portion of Taine's essay on Balzac, in which Père Grandet is contrasted with Harpagon.

The copious notes are perhaps the principal feature of the edition. They are in the main very helpful to the student, though in several cases they appear unnecessarily full. The town *Saumur* is so important in the story as doubtless to justify the notice of about a page that is devoted to it; but the extended comments under *beau-père, Grand' Rue* (to which an entire page is given, deriving *grand* from *grandis*) and a few similar expressions, are possibly of doubtful expediency. The editor goes into etymologies to a judicious extent, but, as just hinted, I am sorry to see him cite in some instances the nominative (in others the accusative) case of the Latin. And in a text like the present one—which I judge no instructor would use with absolute beginners, explanations of the pronunciation of *six* and *sept* might well be dispensed with. The idiomatic renderings are especially good. The repetition, however, of annotations, in case of common expressions like *redingote* and *parents*, seems entirely uncalled for; the more so when, at the second occurrence, the text reads: *il n'a point de parents du côté maternel. Tenir de* is annotated three times, *prendre bon parti* twice, etc. Having in mind the best interests of the class-room, I should say that the editor's notes furnish, in the way of translations, too much aid rather than too little. The matter of referring the student to Littré for derivation may be just a trifle gratuitous; and the bringing in of Mrs. James Brown Potter on the occasion of an incidental mention of Marat in the text, may appear to some rather *tiré par les cheveux.* But however we may differ as to details of annotation, Professor Bergeron deserves our hearty thanks for making available, in a compact and attractive volume, this famous portrayal of what Saintsbury terms "the pushing of thrift to the loathsome excess of an inhuman avarice."

La Frontière is the latest issue (no. 19) in the Jenkins series of *Contes choisis.* The original intention of this series, which was begun some ten years ago, appears to have been to offer, to readers of French in general in this country, reprints of short stories and *nouvelles* by some of the best French writers at a very moderate price. The early issues were without annotation or introductory notice of any kind, the lines were unnumbered, and typographical errors were by no means infrequent. More recently, however, a change has been noticed, in the line of better adaptation to the purposes and needs of class-room instruction. English notes have been appended to several of the earlier editions, and the latest numbers appear at first hand under the guidance of an editor. In the present one, Professor Eggert furnishes a letter from the author, a preface and introduction, a text with numbered lines and almost no misprints, and adequate notes. Such improvement in the editorial tone of the series is gratifying.

Jules Claretie is an "immortal" whom we are always glad to welcome. His popularity is increasing in this country as he becomes better known. One of his shorter stories has already appeared in an earlier issue of the Jenkins series. *Pierrille* is available (Macmillan Co.) in annotated form for use in schools and colleges. And I believe that the author's libretto of the opera *La Navarraise* has brought his name into much favor with the American public during the past winter. *La Frontière* is a decidedly interesting and touching story; its theme is patriotism; the scene is the Alpine frontier between France and Italy. The editing is very conscientiously done; the introductory sketch of the author is appreciative, and the notes are sufficiently full without being tiresome. The little volume is the best of the series, and furnishes, in handy form, excellent material for early reading.

Mr. Effinger's selections from the essays of Sainte-Beuve recall the little edition, of similar scope, of the *Causeries du Lundi,* published some time ago by George Saintsbury in the Clarendon Press Series. A comparison of the two editions shows that the American editor has, in the matter of attractive subjects and connected grouping at least, made some improvement upon the collection of his predecessor. Professor Saintsbury gave a larger number of selections, but only three of them were complete; and his desire to vary the subjects and periods as much as possible caused him to introduce extracts of relatively little or minor interest to the average student. The notes, however, which the English scholar appended were models of annotation, as indeed, to my mind, his notes uniformly are.

Mr. Effinger, on the other hand, has inserted fewer selections and made them complete; has also chosen subjects that are prominent and very attractive. Of the seven articles given the first two, upon *Chateaubriand*, are especially opportune and of twofold interest, as they furnish at the start the author's thorough discussion of his own method. The following *causerie*, upon *Madame Récamier*, not only presents an attractive subject, but is agreeably linked to the fore going articles by the intimacy of the two people concerned. The next essay entitled *Qu'est-ce qu'un classique?* is well placed and affords a practical, straightforward discussion of a pertinent class-room theme. After essays upon *le Roman de Renart* and *Alfred de Musset*, the group closes with an article on the French Academy.

The editor's notes are decidedly terse, and cover chiefly the proper names mentioned in the text. These biographical hints are at times so meagre as to fail to do justice to the writer in question; for example, the references to Musset (occurring before the essay upon him) and Lamartine. Almost no word of comment is offered on points of language, though an occasional aid in this direction would not have been superfluous, nor would it have swelled the notes to an undesirable extent. The Latin expressions found on pp. 86, 87, of the text might well have been rendered. Slips in typography may be noticed on pp. 27, 32, 51, 110, 117. The editor certainly deserves commendation for his happy choice of subjects, and instructors who do not lay too much stress on the matter of annotation will find the volume a very satisfactory basis of work.

B. L. BOWEN.

Ohio State University.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF THE *Nero.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the *Tragedy of Nero*, Act iv, scene iv (*Mermaid Series*, p. 65) occurs the following passage:

> His long continued taxes I forbear,
> In which he chiefly showed himself a prince;
> His robbing altars, sale of holy things,
> The antique goblets of adored rust
> And sacred gifts of kings and people sold.

The editor's preface calls attention to the exceptional vigor of the last three lines, but it has escaped his observation that they are a version of Juvenal, *Sat.* xiii, 147-149:

> Confer et hos, veteris qui tollunt grandia templi
> Pocula adorandae robiginis et populorum
> Dona vel antiquo positas a rege coronas.

A comparison with this original suggests a much-needed correction of the English text. *Sold* is an awkward and obvious tautology with *sale* above. It is not in the Latin and may be got rid of by transfer of the *s* to *people*, reading:

> And sacred gifts of kings and peoples old.

While on the subject, I may remark that this play is full of Classical reminiscences which have eluded the industry of the editors. On page 52, for example, occur the lines:

> But if to Nero's end this only way
> Heaven's justice hath chosen out, and people's love
> Could not but by their feebling ills be moved;
> We do not then at all complain; our harms
> On this condition please us.

A foot-note observes:
"On the torn margin of the MS. is written against the passage the following fragment of a quotation:—

> .   .   .   . venturo
> .   .   .   . liam pituro
> i
> .   .   .   . jam, etc."

With the aid of these indications it requires no Œdipus to see that the poet is adapting Lucan, *Pharsalia*, I. 33 sqq.

> Quod si non *aliam venturo* fata Neroni
> Invenere viam .   .   .   .   .
> *Jam* nihil, O Superi, querimur: scelera ipsa nefasque
> Hac mercede placent.

The original complimentary application to Nero is, of course, reversed.

On page 54 the lines:

> The gods sure keep it hid from us that live,
> How sweet death is, because we should go on
> And be their bails

are modeled on *Pharsalia* iv, 519:

> Victurosque dei celant ut vivere durent
> Felix esse mori.

"Be their bails" I do not understand; qy., "flee their bails"? "break their bails"? or does "because" mean "in order that" here? On page 63 the quaint phrase "the love and dainty of mankind" is an attempt to render the "amor et deliciæ generis humani" of Suetonius, *Tit.* I.

On page 73 the lines:

> "Each best day of our life at first doth go,
>   To them succeeds diseasèd age and woe,"

are a translation of Virgil's

> Optuma quaeque dies miseris mortalibus aevi
> Prima fugit; subeunt morbi tristisque senectus.
>   (*Georgics* iii, 66-67):

and the two following lines:

> "Now die your pleasures, and the day you pray
> Your rhymes and loves and jilts will take away,"

contain a reminiscence of Horace's

> Eripuere jocos venerem convivia ludos.
> Tendunt extorquere poemata.

The "black frogs that croak about the brim" of "th' ill-favored lake" on the same page are Juvenal's "Stygio ranas in gurgite nigras," *Sat.* ii, 150.

There are other reminiscences of Lucan, Seneca and the writers of the "Silver" age, but I have no time to verify them and have, perhaps, given enough to show how the unknown author used his note book.

PAUL SHOREY.

University of Chicago.

CORRECTION.

In table of contents of May, 1896, under *Correspondence*, read F. J. Child for F. C. G. Child.